

THE CLERGY REVIEW

CHRIST'S BROTHERHOOD

A PLEA FOR A MORE CONSTRUCTIVE ATTITUDE TO THE SOVIET.

BY THE REV. J. F. T. PRINCE.

THE plea has been urged often enough for a more positive reaction against Soviet propaganda. But the response to that plea remains inadequate. Inertia stands self-condemned; nor is mere negative polemic enough. A high percentage of anti-Communist propaganda is inept and off the point. It is profoundly ignorant of the situation with which it is attempting to deal; it is utterly unconstructive because it is generated, like Bolshevik propaganda, by fear and hatred rather than courage and love; outside the Church it is (it is a truism to insist) frequently far from ingenuous, palpably representative of a vested interest.

The Catholic attitude is objective and constructive. "I love the people," said Henry George, "and that love brought me to Christ as their best friend and teacher." "And I," answered Cardinal Manning, "I loved Christ and so learned to love the people for whom He died."

Here, *en passant*, lay the contrast in epitome between the humanitarian approach to religion and the religious approach to humanity. The former, not necessarily a contemptible thing and often enough the roundabout means whereby a generous soul has apprehended the Truth, lacks in a degree very evident to a Catholic the certainty, the sure-footedness of the process, the truly normal process, whose reverse it is. For whereas the one medium of access is so easily misapprehended, providing for frail human intelligence so shaky a passage, the other, Christ Himself (the real Christ not of mere

philanthropy but of the Catholic Church), is the great Fact, transcending all discussion and misinterpretation, of absolute and constant value. For the conclusions of anthropology are not unanimous. And Bakounin has proved, in retrospect, a strange philanthropist. Outside the great Christocentric Corporation, through whose eyes all is seen aright, there can be no certain and permanent appreciation of Mankind. The Fraternity proposed to the world by the French Revolution has dwindled to a dismal memory of the guillotine. It never redeemed even its promise of a good square meal. But the brotherhood of Christ which makes us co-heirs of a heavenly Kingdom, has not (even here below) left man naked. True enough, man's contempt has spurned the proffered garment for the most part. But we must not tire of insisting that it is still there. (If only we will wear it—or do we prefer the illusive Brotherhood of the military tribunal, or still, in our perversity, agree to stand naked about the chilly money market, submissive slaves of the ruthless laws of demand and supply?)

For *laissez-faire* is not the Christian policy, and when even, at the Reformation, men contemptuously cast aside ecclesiastical authority and substituted (as a basis of the Industrial system) for Christian principle, the ideal of free competition which means selfish acquisitiveness and the implacable enmity between labour and capital, *even then* the Church had her remedies and her patience was unexhausted. There were the St. Vincents and the Lavedans, just as in every recalcitrant age and civilization since Constantine there have been the devoted hostels of monks and nuns, the Orders of St. Lazarus, of St. John of God, of St. Alexis. It is well that the Catholic of to-day should learn in no uncertain sense of the spirit of service for which our systems of palliation and relief are so inadequate a substitute.

Above all, the faithful must not forget for a single hesitant second that the Church continues to teach, indefatigably, with superlative relevance to reality. For though she transcends the economic sphere and though the world be ever a valley of tears, yet the economic conflict born of selfish acquisitiveness, and the antipathies of narrow nationalism, are things which vanish in the unobstructed light of Catholicism. For the Catholic priest does not believe that the misery of the

submerged classes is a mere trade depression, or that the essence of social life consists in the exchange of commodities.

In the Church's economics labour is not termed a commodity. For labour is flesh and blood and the souls of men. And men and women, and the children of their honest love, were not made to be the appendages and the slaves of capital. Nor is their liberty, their very existence, a grace accorded by the machine. Yet the Church's evaluation of humanity is not the strange humanitarianism of the Bolsheviks, which sacrifices the Person for the Class, and is then surprised to find that the Class does not exist. She cannot deal in abstractions whose only virtue is the immense heroism and sacrifice they require of the individual. Cardinal Manning was enunciating, not an anomalous doctrine requiring special proof, but a fact, part of the reality of man's place in the universe, when he stated intransigently that the law of property was founded on the law of Nature, was sanctioned in revelation, declared in the Christian law, taught by the Catholic Church and incorporated in all true civilization. Deny property and you destroy liberty. That is to say—repudiate, in your theory, the principle of property, the right to possess, and you abolish the possibility of freedom. In practice, confiscate a man's possessions and there follows the effective liquidation of his rights, of his liberty. The renunciation of property that is voluntary is another matter, for it is the attainment of the highest form of freedom. There is no man more free than the Monk, the "bondsmen of God."

It is here that a vital issue is indicated in our present thesis. The psychological basis of Communism is undoubtedly in type religious, though of a false religion. I refer specifically to Russian Communism, to the religious type of consciousness traceable to the early Nihilists, the Russian friends and disciples of Karl Marx. Of this consciousness, self-effacement and the facile renunciation of property is simply a single phenomenon. There is a vivid, and a vividly accurate picture by a modern Russian novelist of a *kulak*, a middle-class peasant, bereft of everything by the Revolution and collectivization, lying half-naked on a hill-side, but ecstatic, exultant in the inspiration

afforded by his supreme abnegation. That this intense religiosity is a national affair with which the other nations cannot vie is possibly indisputable. But the Church transcends the nations; and the Catholic sense is not quickened by a mere economic chimera.

The issue is a religious one and it can be faced only by a religious consciousness which is not afraid, frankly and sincerely, to face the facts. "If only we had half the chances you Catholics have," a Bolshevik said to me, "half the superlative strength of your conviction" [for I think he was nearing disillusionment], "your numbers, your resources, your history, your traditions! You should be ready to do anything, risk anything, give anything on the strength of what you hold to be so certain and so dear. Yet is it Christianity or Communism whose influence relatively is increasing more rapidly?"

The issue is essentially religious. The awakening of a consciousness among Catholic lay-folk that is nothing short of apostolic fervour, this and a sincerity with regard to objective fact that is the "*désintéressement des morts*" this alone can meet the issue and renovate the face of the earth. There need be no "programme," for Catholicism is the whole of life. We cannot insist too urgently on the necessity of education, and, following it, the steady extension of Catholic culture—the inevitable triumph of its influence. Now is the time for a Catholic social *Aufklärung*. We must teach, but first of all we must learn. How many Catholic lay-folk have studied persistently and seriously the "*Quadragesimo Anno*" of Pope Pius XI? How many Catholic laymen have been urged successfully to put its principles into practice?

The Catholic attitude, we have said, is constructive. And the mind of the lay-folk in the parishes must be constructive. The Communism that threatens us from the East has its lesson to teach as well as its menace. We may as well admit it. Poor Russia, preaching (the present writer can attest from experience) with immense missionary zeal a Messiah it has not got, is at least a challenge to us who have the absolute Truth.

Not long ago a book was published under the auspices of the Soviet, intended to interest the rising generation in the mechanization of Russia. Its treatment of the electrification of production and transport, the damming of rivers and the blowing up of mountains was entirely

romantic. It was in fact a poem bursting with the dynamic of youth about the industrial education of a raw stripling country—the continent comprised by the U.S.S.R. It does not, of course, require genius to write poetry about the communal mastery of machinery, steel production and factory-grouping for the utilization of by-products, but it requires the inspiration and prolific joy of conviction.

"In a single year," shouts a Bolshevik periodical for children, "we have produced nearly 5,000,000 tons of steel; and this is nothing to what we are going to do. But it means work and enthusiasm." It is the enthusiasm of Bolshevik Youth that is so alarming. It is alarming not merely because of the thing to which it is harnessed, but because it reminds us of the enthusiasm which alas! so many of us lack. For the rising generation who are facing Leninism, unprotected and unfed, Communism is likely to become the whole of life.

Communism is the complete usurper. Here is the real menace—a Capitalist society retaining only the veneer and antique form of organized religion, lacking a profundity of motive which Communism claims to supply. Living Catholicism is the only solution, providing the only motive force. And behind every social movement in the parish, behind all our polemic, must be the spirit in which we say the Pater Noster—the Sonship of God, the Brotherhood of Christ which is the supremest evaluation of humanity; the fruit of Christ's passion and death obtaining for men, in the words of St. Peter, that they may become partakers of the Divine Nature.

THE CHURCH'S RIGHT TO INTERVENE IN POLITICS

BY F. R. HOARE.

II.

THE attempts of the great Greek political thinkers to devise means for securing the subjection of the laws and actions of the State to the moral law are only the most completely reasoned examples of the general recognition by the pre-Christian mind of the ethical character of the major questions of politics, and have their analogues in traditions so remote as that of the preoccupation of Chinese moral philosophy with statesmanship, as exemplified in Lao-tse, Confucius and Mencius, and the part played by the ethical precepts of the Brahmins in tempering the despotism of the Hindu rajahs. Likewise, their failure to prevent the State becoming in the last resort the interpreter of the moral law in its own regard (if not the source of it) was only a particular aspect of the world-wide breakdown of natural religion and morality in consequence of sin and the loss of the original grace.

For upon the withdrawal of the supernatural light there followed confusion both in the mind's perception of the laws written within it and in the external order in which it should have been able to find exterior confirmation of them; nor was there any religious body or school of philosophy (if we except the institutions and prophets peculiar to the Chosen People) that could enunciate them with the requisite authority or clarity. There is no need to look further to account for the fact that even the most sustained attempts of the ancient thinkers to base political institutions upon natural morality afforded, at one point or another, a loophole for State absolutism; nor any justification, under the circumstances, for inferring from the failure that what was attempted was inconsistent with sound natural reason. The world had only to wait for the restoration of natural reason for its real findings to become clear.

This restoration was not effected by direct methods, such as a miraculous act of physical re-creation. It was effected by God uniting human nature to His own and inviting men, thus made His brothers, to share His own Nature.

For, if they accepted and lived by His supernatural gift, they experienced, as one of its consequences, the beginnings of a renewal of their natural perfections also—of a return to the archetypal humanity which He had restored in Himself through His Mother when He fertilized her seed by His divine Spirit.

Correspondingly, the Church which He founded for the continuance of His sojourn among men, taught them primarily the supernatural goal, and the supernatural way to it, which He had opened to them; but taught them with equal certainty the laws of the human nature in which they had to live on their way to Heaven, and live lawfully if they were to reach Heaven. Consequently she took her stand among men and human societies as, at the same time, the custodian of revelation and the long lacking authority competent to pronounce on the moral issues unceasingly raised by men's natural affairs, but hitherto confused by their sins and follies.

She fulfils these tasks in the first instance by teaching the laws of both worlds to her own members; but so long as they were outlaws in this one (as for the most part they were for nearly her first three centuries) their better grasp of their natural duties could have little political influence upon political society, and their supernatural duties were the ground of their outlawry. When, however, the time came for them to move among their fellow-men as fellow-citizens, their conduct and principles could not fail to have political effect, whether by bringing pressure on political society to mend its ways or by provoking it to press them to abandon theirs. For as citizens of whatever grade they had a corresponding responsibility, and were in duty bound to use their status towards restoring political institutions and laws to that natural standard revived in their hearts and proclaimed anew by their teachers.

At this stage, therefore, of the history of Christianity, the double aspect of the moral teaching of the Church,

concerning social and political conduct, stood manifest. First, they are rulings that certain conduct is lawful or unlawful for individual men *in foro conscientiae*. But since this conduct is enjoined, permitted, or forbidden by the institutions and laws of the State, they are also rulings, at least by implication, that certain acts or laws of the State fall, or do not fall, within the limits of the natural moral law. For no law can fall within those limits that ordains morally unlawful conduct upon individual men, or violates their natural moral rights. And, as we have seen, the best even of pre-Christian thought admitted that the acts and laws of the State were subject to moral judgments on such grounds.

Now these implicit or explicit pronouncements of the Church on the morality (and, therefore, the validity) of public acts, as well as on the rightness of private ones, will not necessarily have any direct effect upon the governments and institutions concerned. When those have come into existence outside the sphere of influence of the Catholic Church, it is likely enough that they will give only a very perfunctory recognition to the moral law as the sanction of their validity; and certain that, even so far as they do recognize it, they will not recognize the Church as its authoritative exponent. Nor will there be any constitutional provision for their invalidation or removal by the mere pronouncement by the Church that they are unlawful. Therefore, if such pronouncements are to have constitutional effect, it will have to be brought about by the action of individual Catholic citizens exercising their civic rights. This will certainly be an advance on a state of affairs in which Catholicism is outlawed and Catholics have no means of constitutional action even as individuals, but it will not amount to an actual exercise of authority by the Church over the constitutions of States.

But suppose that the political community has grown up as a Catholic community—not as in any sense the Church, for the Church is wider than any merely human society and is supernatural as well—but in the sense that practically all its members are Catholics and, further, that Catholic principles have been the determining influence in the formation of its constitution and laws. In that case the pronouncements of the Church concerning the morality and validity of the enactments

and actions of the organs of government will have constitutional force in their own right and not merely to the extent to which they can move individual Catholic citizens to constitutional action. Laws will be invalidated, not by being repealed, but by the Pope's pronouncement that they are invalid; and rulers will be deposed, not by revolutions, but by the Pope's declaration that they are not lawful rulers and that the citizens are released from their allegiance to him; and if legislators or kings are recalcitrant it will not be those who resist them who are seditious or revolutionaries, but they and those who support them.

The reason for this is that in a community of Catholics there will not be more than one authority properly recognized as the arbiter, in the last resort, of moral questions, and that authority will be the Church. It cannot rightfully make any difference whether those questions are raised by the private conduct of individuals or by the public conduct of the community or its officers. They will still be moral questions, and there is only one moral law, and, since Pentecost, only one final interpreter on earth of that moral law. Furthermore, just as the supernatural religion of the citizens will point to the Church as the proper article of all moral issues, so the sound natural political philosophy that she fosters will recognize that the fundamental issues of politics are moral issues; and, in a genuinely Catholic State, its constitution, written or unwritten, will provide, explicitly or implicitly, that the pronouncements of the Church on moral issues raised by political actions and events shall have constitutional force. Add the fact that when the Church is dealing, not with private individuals, but with political communities or their public officers, the Pope is ordinarily the arbiter in the first instance, and not merely in the last resort, and we have in outline the theory of what is called the Indirect Temporal Power.

At first sight this term may seem most unsuitable, for, as we have seen, there is a sense in which this power of the Pope over the State and its constitution is a direct power in contrast with the indirect power which he sometimes wields through the action of individual Catholic citizens using their civic rights in accordance with the principles he lays down. Nevertheless, the power is properly called indirect in the sense

that it is not exercised over political acts as such, but only in so far as they raise moral or spiritual issues. The Church, as was said earlier, fully recognizes, and indeed insists on, the right and duty of the State to regulate its own affairs, including its own constitution, within the limits of the moral law; and only takes official cognisance of such matters when there is a question of the moral law being infringed, and even then does not officially pronounce on the best political solution of the conflict with the moral law, but states the law and declares the acts infringing it invalid or the persons deposed from their office and leases it to the political community to work out a fresh solution in conformity with her pronouncements. Any further action taken beyond this is distinctly the work of individual ecclesiastics or by way of advice; it is not an exercise of Indirect Temporal Power.

Hence this power is an Indirect Temporal Power because, strictly speaking, it is a spiritual power exercised incidentally in temporal things, which it judges indirectly by way of their spiritual bearings. In this it is to be contrasted with the Direct Temporal Power, which is unequivocally a temporal and political power—the territorial sovereignty of the Pope, exercised by him, not as the head of the spiritual community which is the Church, but as a prince or king ruling territory in Italy. It is true that this power is claimed and exercised by the Popes as a peculiarly appropriate means of enabling the head on earth of the Church to exercise his spiritual functions without interference, and has, in fact, been a peculiarly appropriate means to this end for many centuries; but it remains a strictly political, that is a directly temporal power, and might conceivably be dispensed with in the future, as it was in the past, without detriment to his spiritual functions if some equally satisfactory means of securing his independence were in existence. The Indirect Temporal Power, on the other hand, is essentially a spiritual power, flowing from the very nature of the Pope's spiritual authority and functions.

It is true that it is not always operative, but this is not because the Pope's authority and functions alter with the course of time, but solely because, as we have seen, it can only come into operation when there exists a certain combination of political circumstances, namely a political

community consisting of Catholics and, what is more, formed on Catholic principles, and giving explicitly or implicitly constitutional recognition to them. When these factors are present the latent Indirect Temporal Power comes into operation automatically. This, incidentally, is a sufficient answer to those who say that its exercise was a usurpation and the cessation of its exercise a recantation.

It makes it clear, also, how it was that, even when their power was, generally speaking, in operation in Western Europe, there were many occasions on which it was ineffective. For its operation depends, not merely on the theoretical recognition on the part of rulers and citizens of supernatural and natural principles which, in combination, underly it, but on their practical obedience to these principles, and this has by no means always been forthcoming even from otherwise practising Catholics or communities nursed into existence by the Church. And perhaps in no field of human action are otherwise good Catholics so prone to find excuses for disobeying the authority of the Church as in that of politics. But that proneness and its causes, of which the chief is nationalism, and its consequences, of which the chief was the disruption of Christendom, are outside the scope of the present study of the principles on which the Church intervenes in politics.

To return, then, to the circumstances under which the Indirect Temporal Power becomes operative, we see that it forms a third stage in the unfolding of the political implications of the Church's division, the first being that at which her spiritual subjects are politically outlaws, and the second being that at which they can as individual citizens wield constitutional pressure in accordance with her principles in a community not organized completely on those principles or not recognizing her as the authoritative exponent of them. In a general way it can be said that these three stages succeeded each other historically in that order, though if this were an historical study it would be necessary to qualify the statement in many ways. It can further be said, and with less need for qualification, that with the break-up of mediæval Christendom came a reversion to the second stage, in which the vast majority of Catholics are now living. Not even the most Catholic States acknowledge anything

properly to be described as the Indirect Temporal Power, and on the other hand, Catholics are nowhere, as yet, formally excluded from civic rights on the sole ground that they are Catholics. That the wheel is coming full circle and a return to the first stage is imminent over a large part of the Catholic world, seems indeed likely enough, but this is not an essay in prophecy any more than in history.

Having, then, for the sake of clarifying our ideas and terminology, enumerated the other typical forms taken by the Church's intervention in politics, it remains to dwell a little longer on the situation in which we Catholics at the moment find ourselves, when the Pope's assertions of the primacy of the spiritual and moral law against the so-called sovereign State take the form neither of martyrdom on the one hand, nor Bulls of deposition on the other, but of Encyclicals, Concordats and the Lateran Treaty. By his Encyclicals he reiterates the natural law by which politics and social questions should in the last resort be judged; applying it to those (among which economic and matrimonial problems stand out) to which the circumstances of our time have made its application most urgent; and addressing himself in the first instance to his spiritual subjects, whose civic rights lay upon them a corresponding responsibility for bringing it to bear, but also to those statesmen who are not his subjects but whose sense of moral truth may incline them to listen to its exposition even if they recognize no special or supernatural authority in him who expounds it. By his Concordats he secures some minimum of legal recognition by the State of those essential spiritual and moral rights that it has no moral right to infringe, using for a lever not only the intrinsic power of truth but also the importance to the body politic of reaching a *modus vivendi* with a section of its citizens, who though they do not constitute the State, have political weight in it, and, if they are loyal to their principles, will without desiring it, be a strain upon its fabric so long as those principles, which are universal principles, are not given their proper place among the laws even of a State which was not founded on them. By the Lateran Treaty he put his independence as a teacher of political ethics and his sovereignty as a negotiator with States both beyond cavil in an age which does not regard his commission

as divine or sufficient of itself to set him outside the limits of any human authority.

Of these instruments, the Encyclicals are of the most general concern, and challenge all of us in that department of our lives and thought in which, as was said at the beginning of this essay, some Catholics are most liable to deny the Church a hearing. The Church, they say, has a right to speak on moral questions, but these are political questions; and behind this protest lies that variety of fallacies concerning politics that has already been analysed. But the Encyclicals refute our positions, by their number, range and tenor, rendering ludicrous the plea that such interventions are occasional aberrations which one may ignore without ceasing to be a good Catholic and making explicit the precise manner in which the political questions of which they treat do in fact raise moral issues.

It is perhaps in the field of economics that this lesson most needs to be enforced. When specifically religious questions are under discussion evasion is scarcely possible even for the most reluctant among us; and when it is a matter of marriage law, birth prevention or sterilization, there exists a fairly general sense among Catholics that however much we may dislike the political and social dilemmas into which the Church's pronouncements put us, and however little we may understand their rationale, still, it is the sort of thing in which one must expect the Church to want a voice, and one must make the best of it. But when we come to economic questions, then there are many of every school of thought who find it exceedingly hard to admit that the Pope can have the right officially to claim a hearing for any but the widest and vaguest "Christian principles" capable of being invoked in favour of almost any preconceived economic policy.

Yet there was a time not so many centuries ago when in most European countries the most concrete industrial and commercial operations were naturally regarded as subject to moral judgments, and when to pass and enforce these judgments was an ordinary duty of government. Prices were denominated "just" or "unjust," not to provoke a sentimental reaction, but as appealing to an enforceable moral law. Cornering the market and holding goods back till the price rose were, under other names,

punishable and punished by legal process. To take interest for the mere use of money was definitely sinful for any Christian. And all these judgments could be, and were, deduced by strict logic from moral principles that are equally true to-day.

But to-day practically the whole edifice of industry, commerce and finance is based on a disregard of these judgments, and if they are made they are treated as, at most, edifying counsels which it would be nice to see followed if it could be done. The actual solutions are subjected to quite other tests, such as the maximum of profit to be made from a particular method of operation or organization, and submitted to the verdict of accountants and mathematicians rather than of teachers of ethics, either secular or ecclesiastical. Yet it is both possible and probable that if moral test were once again applied quite definitely and enforced by law—the others being relegated to a secondary place—we should find that the cancer that afflicts our economic life had been cut out at the root and that a sane and temperate prosperity followed as a highly tempered physical vigour may follow a successful operation. Were not all such goods to be added if the justice of God's kingdom was put first? But we cannot hope to have actual experience of this unless we are prepared to listen to the voice of our teacher whenever it is raised and to treat his pronouncements, not as sentiments to sweeten our dreams, but as judgment to be executed if we would escape the wrath of God. Nor should it be the least of our motives for doing this, that, while we falter, the enemy marches on and, by promising to eliminate those very injustices that we have failed to eliminate and are accused of endorsing, blinds men to the fact that his remedies require the destruction of all those securities for social justice—property, family, liberty, and the worship of God—that alone make it worth while that social injustices should be eliminated.

Other examples might, of course, be taken from other fields—the ethics of nationalism, for instance, and of internationalism—but we should only be repeating the same argument. Wherever we turn we find that definite moral teaching is our most urgent need if we are to judge and act soundly in the great social political issues of our day, and that everywhere the great Popes of the

last half-century have accepted the responsibility for giving it. It remains for us to take their pronouncements seriously, not as essays but as orders. We must not be minimizers in this matter of the function of the Church in respect of political questions raising moral issues, and try to confine it to telling us of a few extreme cases in which we cannot obey a law under pain of sin. Not only passive but active obedience to her teachings is required of us, and precisely in proportion as we have the status of responsible citizens. It is sheer disloyalty to Rome to say that we take our religion from Rome but our politics from our party, when we intend by that to withdraw from Rome's judgment all questions falling within the sphere of politics. A question is not necessarily less a moral question because it is also a political one; and when it is a moral one, then as Catholic citizens we must be the more forward in pressing our principles just because it is also a political one, just because political questions are ordinarily discussed by non-Catholics without reference to definite moral principles, and if we do not raise the moral issue it will almost certainly lapse by default.

We are near enough to the non-moral State as it is, and though it would be idle to sigh for the days when the Pope's judgments bound statesmen and States *de jure publico*, it is not idle to exercise to the full in the interest of the Pope's judgments all those constitutional rights that are still left to individual Catholics. Indeed, there is a special urgency in doing so. For constitutional rights have a precarious life in these days, when single Parties claim to "inform" the State and States so "informed" claim superiority to conscience. Unless we resist this tendency by utilizing such political rights as we are still free to use we shall find that we lose more than political liberty; and we shall not effectively sustain our political rights unless we use them to sustain moral principles in politics. To use them to promote what is merely expedient is to play into the hands of the non-moral State, which will, with some show of reason under the circumstances, claim to be source of all that we recognize as our political good.

But this is where we Catholics have a strength beyond our fellows if we will only regard the pronouncements of our Popes as weapons and not as burdens. For to

no mere sect or party is it given to have the first principles of their political action laid down for them in a form indubitably ethical and spiritual and certainly true, and therefore supremely fitted to vindicate the great truth that the State exists to serve moral ends by moral means. Without a guarantor raised above all politics and himself divinely guaranteed, no principles can, in the moral fog of our age, escape from being confused indistinguishably with principles that are not moral and even immoral. With him to guarantee them, we can go forward and use them as the one sure remedy for our political and social ills.

THE REPETITION OF EXTREME UNCTION

MONTHLY ANOINTING.

BY THE REV. DAVID BARRY, S.T.L.

IT is remarkable that, both in the Code of Canon Law and in the edition of the Roman Ritual issued in accordance with it, there is a change in the time-honoured wording of the direction as to when the Sacrament of Extreme Unction is to be repeated. In the current legislation this runs as follows: "In the same illness this Sacrament cannot be repeated unless the sick person has recovered after being anointed, and has fallen into another danger to his life."¹ Whereas in the various editions of the old Ritual this was the literal wording of the rubric: "In the same illness this Sacrament ought not to be repeated unless it is protracted, as if on an occasion when the sick person, having rallied, falls again into the danger of death."

It will have been observed that the substance of the change consists in excluding the proviso that, to justify or necessitate re-administration, the illness must be a long one. And a person is on safe ground in coming to the conclusion that its omission in the current legislation is not without point and significance.

Now Father Cappello has this year issued a work² dealing with practically every aspect of Extreme Unction. The question of its repetition gets particularly full treatment. And, although he does not call attention to the change in the phraseology of the rubric dealing with this subject, his book makes it both opportune and easy to examine the relevant principles, with a view to reaching a practical conclusion for those of the clergy who are called upon almost every day to decide the anxious question whether they may, or must, confer the

¹ Code, canon 940, §2. Cf. Roman Ritual, tit. V, cap. 1, n. 8 (1925).

² *De Extrema Unctione*, Romae, 1932.

Sacrament again on someone whose name has been for a considerable time in the sick-call book.

Very curious views have been held from time to time even by Catholics on this subject; and the reasons are now and then as weak and far-fetched as the conclusions based on them are singular and dangerous.

Some authorities, for example, at the end of the eleventh century, one of whom was a Cardinal and the other a canonized Saint, were strongly of opinion that it should never be repeated, and that to do so had no warrant in the writings or practice of any of the Fathers. The Saint in question was Saint Ivo. He styled Extreme Unction a Sacrament of public penance. His words are wide enough to show that he was not in favour of repeating any Sacrament at all; and he refers to Saint Augustine and Saint Ambrose as asserting that anointing could not be repeated any more than Baptism. The fact is, however, that these Fathers, instead of going into any detail about the administration of Extreme Unction, make only meagre and rather obscure allusion to the Sacrament at all. Although it was well-known to both of them, and came within the scope of their ministerial duties, as "the laying on of hands" or "the imposing of hands on the sick."

However this may be, the peculiar view in question was completely put out of court not only by the Council of Florence and the Council of Trent but by Saint Thomas long before these were held. In the Bull of Eugene IV (*Exultate Deo*, November 22nd, 1439), containing the Decree for the Armenians issued in connection with the Council of Florence, it is laid down that three Sacraments imprint on the soul an indelible mark as a result of which they cannot be repeated in the case of the same person. "But the other four do not impress the character and admit of being repeated." While the Council of Trent in one of its canons traces the fact that some Sacraments cannot be repeated to the character they confer. And inasmuch as Extreme Unction does not do anything of this kind, it follows that it may be re-administered. And this point is explicitly taught by the same Council when it says that: "If the sick after being anointed recover, they can again be aided by this Sacrament when they are overtaken by another similar danger to life." The profession of Catholic faith

prescribed by Pius IV (November 18th, 1564) and all the old rituals, not to speak at all of the Code and the new Ritual, are decisive on this point. And to appeal to Saint Thomas to enforce it would be knocking at an open door or preaching to the converted.

It may not be superfluous, however, to quote him with a view to ascertain what, in his view, is the precise reason why the Sacrament may be repeated. He tells us in the *Summa Theologica*³ that "no Sacrament or sacramental which has a perpetual effect may be repeated. For repetition would show that the Sacrament is not capable of producing that effect; and this would be an insult to it. But a Sacrament which has a passing effect may be repeated without irreverence, so that the effect which has been lost may be again recovered. Well, seeing that the health of the body and mind—the effect of Extreme Unction—may be lost again after it has been regained, this Sacrament can be lawfully repeated in order to restore it again."

Similarly in the *Summa contra Gentiles*,⁴ the Angelic Doctor tells us that Extreme Unction is not to be given to all who are ill, but only to those whose weakness has brought them to death's door. If these recover, and suffer a relapse, they can be re-anointed. Because this anointing is not like the washing in Baptism; nor is it an unction for the purpose of consecrating—as in Confirmation—which would never be renewed. For what is once consecrated always remains so. But the anointing in this Sacrament is for the purpose of healing, and the recuperative effects of medicine ought to be made available for the sick person as often as he needs them.

Suarez⁵ also, and indeed all modern theologians, follow the reasoning of Saint Thomas closely; and they appeal to the analogy of bodily medicine to explain the repetition of Extreme Unction. Suarez himself argues that if some physical disease attacks a man, and a particular medicine brings him through, it is natural that when he has had a relapse, he should be given the same medicine again. So in the spiritual order the Sacrament can be given often, for the reason that in a

³ Supplementum, qu. 33, art. 1, corp.

⁴ Lib. IV, cap. 73.

⁵ *De Extrema Unctione*, disp. 40, sect. 4, nn. 4 sqq.

new illness the patient needs fresh help. For the assistance given through the previous unction in the course of another disease was intended only for the cure and relief of that particular disease. And in fact, as we shall see later, even though the very same disease persists, if its intensity varies sufficiently in degree, and you have a period of marked improvement followed by another acute attack, the efficacy of the medicine may conceivably not outlast these changes; or else it is possible to reinforce it, with the result that Extreme Unction can be conferred again *in the same illness*.

Of those who used to be prepared to entertain the idea of the repetition of the Sacrament, but were very guarded in allowing it in practice, some stipulated that an interval of *three years* should have elapsed since the previous anointing. These apparently have not left on record—so far as Cappello discloses—any of the reasons which influenced them in taking up such an arbitrary position.

According to others, among whom is the honoured name of Saint Albert the Great, the anointing cannot take place twice within the *same year* even though a new attack of a dangerous illness has supervened. Thus Saint Albert, misled by false astronomical and false medical theories, required more than a year to warrant the re-anointing of chronic patients. And this view was adopted as a practical rule by very many diocesan rituals in the sixteenth century for chronic cases.

The theories of a one year's and of a three years' interval had never much of a following in the Schools even if they had in practice; and they have been for many a day abandoned and discredited. The same, however, cannot be said of a third attempt to regulate the re-administration of the Sacrament by a *time* standard, rather than by some norm based on the patient's needs and condition. I am alluding to the view of those who allow or insist on repetition after a month, if the priest is satisfied that the illness since the last anointing has lasted that period. This opinion, which helps to relieve him of the necessity of making any minute or tedious inquiries about the course of the illness since his former ministrations, is spoken of by Cappello as if it were obsolete or obsolescent.

But, as a matter of fact, it is even yet held, or at least

favoured, by a respectable number of theologians in the English-speaking world. And it is sanctioned by them as a practical rule for the guidance of the clergy charged with the cure of souls in dealing with those who have been for some time seriously or dangerously ill. These would include consumptive patients; those suffering from various forms of heart disease; those who suffer from cancer in its advanced stages; those who have had a stroke of apoplexy; and those suffering from dropsy, whether it is due to heart disease, kidney disease, or liver complaints. Accordingly this theory, being recommended as a handy and workable one for the treatment of so many categories of patients that we meet with almost every day, deserves closer examination and greater consideration than the other two that I have mentioned, which attempted to set a time limit for the re-administration of Extreme Unction, and which have been for a many a day retired to the museum of theological curiosities.

I cannot say whether or not the rule of a month's interval, as it is in vogue at present, is in unbroken historical continuity with that stigmatized, for instance, by Suarez. It may be an interesting survival or it may mark an instance of revival after a period of eclipse and neglect. In any case though length of days is honourable, it is no guarantee of worth; and if the truth is great and will prevail, falsehood is also very tenacious of life.

However this may be, many who at the present day mention this theory with respect are rather careful not to endorse it explicitly or make their own of it very confidently. In proof of this I may refer to O'Kane's well-known text-book, *Notes on the Rubrics of the Roman Ritual*,⁶ and Father Slater's *Moral Theology*.⁷ In the former work we are told that "it may be contended that there is, generally speaking, ground for such a doubt [whether the state of the disease has really changed] in the case of anyone who lives a month after receiving Extreme Unction, and is still in danger of death; and that therefore in a tedious illness the Sacrament should, as a general rule, be repeated after

⁶ N. 878.

⁷ Cf. *Irish Theological Quarterly* for January, 1907, p. 182.

the lapse of a month." Slater is equally wary and cautious in his recommendation of the principle in question as a guide in pastoral action. For, instead of committing himself definitely to it, he contents himself with saying that it embodies the view of some responsible writers, and gives the same reason for it as O'Kane.

Other authorities, while nominally adhering to the month rule, have so refined it away by conditions and qualifications as to render it virtually useless. Some, for example, merely attach this value to it, that if the priest lacks every other indication as to a change in the patient's condition calling for re-anointing, he may, if he wishes, fall back on the principle of the monthly change to warrant him in doing so.

Not one of the writers in *Latin* on Moral Theology or the Rubrics that I have had the advantage of consulting prescribes or recommends the rule of the month's interval between the anointings, with the possible exception of Noldin, in a cryptic way quite at variance with the definiteness and perspicuity that usually mark his exposition. Génicot also considers that it is laudable—though not obligatory—to re-anoint patients in an hospital who are suffering from phthisis, and who are from time to time able to get up and ramble about the garden; although the fell disease from which they are suffering relaxes its hold, indeed, but never looses this altogether. He comes to the conclusion that the Sacrament may be conferred on these again after a sufficiently notable interval, which he estimates as a month or two.

The other Latin authors that are readily accessible, though, as we shall see, many of them speak of a month's *convalescence* or of a *turn for the better* during that period as a condition of re-anointing, never even allude or contemplate the month's *interval between the anointings* as a ready way for the priest to reckon his obligation of again attending to his patient. Suarez in his day certainly repudiated it emphatically: "Some assign a month for repetition guided by an arbitrary whim of their own rather than by any certain reason."⁸ And Cappello, in our day, refers to it on two occasions contemptuously, and summarily disposes of it by

⁸ Op. cit., disp. 40, sect. 4, n. 7.

remarking that "clearly it is not a question of whether the time is longer or shorter, but as to whether or not there has been a relapse into a dangerous illness, that it is vital to consider."⁹

Now if a person under the guidance of St. Thomas examines into the reasons for repeating Extreme Unction the conclusion of Suarez and Cappello seems perfectly justified. According to the Angelic Doctor "this Sacrament does not regard sickness merely, but also the different states of sickness . . . there are certain lingering diseases such as consumption, dropsy and others of the kind, in which the patient should not be anointed unless they seem to lead to the danger of death. Well, if a man escapes from that danger [after being anointed], and again falls back into it in the course of the same sickness, he can be again anointed; for this marks as it were a *new state of the disease*, although strictly speaking it is not a new disease."¹⁰

The Scholastics consistently teach, following the lead of St. Thomas and also of Saint Bonaventure and the Master of the Sentences, that the anointing can be validly and lawfully repeated as often as one of the faithful either is attacked by a lethal disease; or falls into a new state or stage of the same disease, or as it is very commonly put, into a fresh danger of death in the same illness. The theologians, while *allowing* re-anointing in the latter case, do not as a rule, so far as I am aware, say that it is *compulsory*.

Suarez goes to the root of the question when he says that if a serious disease lasts for a long time, and the patient is in danger of death and is anointed, he can be re-anointed if there has been a certain degree of convalescence for a time followed by a relapse.¹¹ Now to anyone who analyses this teaching of Suarez (which is that of theologians generally) and examines its implications, it is clear that two conditions are required in order to receive Extreme Unction a second time in the same illness; (1) there must be some degree of recovery or relief from the attack that justified the administration of the Sacrament in the first instance;

⁹ Op. cit., nn. 258, 3^o and 262, 4.

¹⁰ *Summa Theologica*, supplementum, qu. 33, art. 2, corp.

¹¹ Loco cit., n. 6.

and (2) after this partial recovery or convalescence there must be a relapse. Suarez insists on there being an interruption of the illness, in other words, that the patient becomes tolerably well or takes a turn for the better. This in his view cannot be a mere apparent or fancied improvement without any basis of fact; for he supposes¹² that it is of such a kind that in the opinion of doctors, and of those who know what they are speaking about (*prudendum*), the patient is for the time being freed from that special state of his complaint. He allows that the intermediate period of recovery between the two attacks may be short, without attempting to define how short. He clearly requires, though, that it be a reality and not merely a figment of the imagination of optimistic friends or kind visitors, who are always anxious to say the good word.

Well, anyone who considers the matter carefully will, I think, agree that there is very little reason for assuming that these two states of (1) incomplete recovery followed by (2) acute attack, recur every month in a tedious or lingering illness. I venture to say that a not very intimate acquaintance with the sick will be enough to show that, say consumptives or cancer patients, for a considerable time before their death, have often not even a fairly good or easy night at all. They are going down-hill progressively; the virulence of their disease is being aggravated constantly, and their own feebleness and prostration are becoming steadily more marked every day; and they are gradually sinking.

There may be something in the view that a person suffering for a long time reaches occasionally what I may call a new epoch in his illness, if not really, at least according to the moral estimation of men. Certain persons may regard the vicissitudes of the patient's condition in this way.¹³ But certainly there are many instances where the realities are so stubborn and so sad that the most hopeful cannot discern or fancy any improvement or intermission at all in the onset of the disease, not to speak, say, of a monthly one. It is but too often easy to trace a course of constant and steady deterioration. But no mere change for the worse will of itself warrant the

¹² *Loco cit.*, n. 7.

¹³ Génicot (*Theologia Moralis*, n. 423, ed. 1921) considers that such a view may be acted on if an illness has lasted for a year.

repetition of the Sacrament in the same illness, unless this change has been preceded by an incomplete convalescence. To put the matter in a nutshell, if there is a second anointing this can only be as a result of *ups* as well as *downs* in the sick person's medical history; or, in other words, of an improvement that is not maintained.

I may now be asked, seeing that I attach so little importance to the theory of monthly changes—or indeed of any *fixed* periodical changes—as a guide for re-administering Extreme Unction, how it has survived as a rough and ready rule, and continues to receive a certain measure of support. Well, speaking with all reserve and hesitation, I may give it as my personal opinion for what it is worth that the *month's interval between the anointings* was confused by some writers with the *month's partial convalescence*, which Saint Alphonsus¹⁴ and many other theologians insist on. This misreading was a venial error enough; for the month in this context is very commonly mentioned by Latin authors. However, it is, so far as I can see, almost invariably used by them in reference to the convalescence, which is supposed to be of this length in order to show that it is real, though, from the nature of the case, partial.

Thus Saint Alphonsus says that four or five days of convalescence are not enough to show that the onset of the disease has abated, and he says that a notable time is required. This he interprets to mean a month. And the same period is suggested by Lehmkuhl, Génicot, Tanquerey and others to show that the improvement was genuine though a mere passing phase. Of course, all the authors do not insist on such a long period. Pruemmer,¹⁵ for example, suggests not only the month but a week as an alternative. Cappello mentions the same two periods,¹⁶ but he also speaks¹⁷ of a few days as sufficient, and repudiates the notion that a day or two is enough, unless the case has some peculiar complexion. Tanquerey and Noldin¹⁸ also specify the month.

¹⁴ *Theologia Moralis*, lib. VI, n. 715.

¹⁵ *Manuale Theologiae Moralis*, III, n. 582 (ed. 1923).

¹⁶ *Op cit.*, n. 258, 2°.

¹⁷ N. 259, 4.

¹⁸ *De Sacramentis*, n. 462, 3 (ed. 1904).

So convalescence for that period is met with often enough in the literature of the subject to get readily confused with the old theory of a month's interval between the anointings; and the latter may be said for this reason to have got a new lease of life.

In the second place, I venture to think that making the repetition depend on the lapse of time—a month in the theory we are considering—may be in part attributable to a mistaken notion of the drift of the old rubric about re-anointing. This, as we saw already, used to run: "In the same illness this Sacrament should not be repeated unless it is protracted, as if on an occasion when the sick person becomes convalescent and falls into another danger of death." Now I believe that some people read—and wrongly—the last clause as merely giving one example of a number of cases calling for repetition. So they may have reasoned that it was not merely changes in the patient's condition, but the mere fact by itself that his sickness was prolonged, that would justify the priest in again giving him the Sacrament. Then the question would arise as to what was the long time contemplated by the rubric; and a month, as a considerable period, naturally suggested itself.

This, however, was an inaccurate appreciation of the meaning and content of the old rubric. For the Latin words: "*ut si cum infirmus convalescerit*"—which I have translated "as if on an occasion when the sick person becomes convalescent," really were equivalent to "*tunc tantum si.*" Accordingly the only case justifying repetition, however long the illness might be, was convalescence succeeded by a relapse.

But the mistaken notion that a long period of time by itself, without any reference to varying degrees of severity in the complaint, makes re-administration incumbent, may easily be gathered from the first paragraph of Saint Alphonsus¹⁹ dealing with this subject. For he says that "when the sickness is not prolonged, in order to repeat Extreme Unction, it is necessary that sick persons should have recovered from their former illness and should have fallen into another similar danger to life." Now perhaps a not unnatural conclusion to draw from this is that when the illness is prolonged

¹⁹ *Loco cit.*

these changes are not necessary, seeing that the Saint only postulates them when it is *not* prolonged. However, when a person reads his very next paragraph this false impression is completely removed, and he is seen to be quite in line with authorities generally on the subject. But if Saint Alphonsus is liable to be misunderstood by a casual or superficial or cursory reader, why not the rubric on which he bases his teaching?

Now if a long time were once accepted as a warrant for re-anointing, there is no reason why a month would not be considered such, seeing, as I said already, that in this particular connection a month's convalescence is regarded by so many as of considerable or "notable" duration.

Be this as it may, any possible ambiguity in the old rubric has been removed by the omission of the word *diuturna* [protracted] both in the Code and in the new Ritual. Consequently the only rule that is now in force for repetition is that based on convalescence and a setback, that is to say, on an appreciable improvement that is not continued.

The suppression of all reference to time has the additional advantage that a priest will now not hesitate to confer the Sacrament on a second occasion if the changes in the course of the disease are sufficiently marked, even though the illness be a rather short one. While the reference to its being long in the old rubric did not give much encouragement to re-anoint in such a case, at least to one who merely dipped into or skimmed over the direction in question.

Although the principle is now quite clear, the difficulty remains of ascertaining in actual fact when there has been a noticeable and genuine recovery. The only assistance that the theologians can give in the matter is to specify the length of time that it may reasonably be expected to last, if it is real at all. And as we saw already they assign various periods. A month's temporary relief seems to be favoured by the large majority; while others are satisfied with a week or even less. The truth is, I suppose, that the time depends on circumstances, and especially on the degree of the apparent improvement; if this is slight and variable it must last fairly long, whereas if it is marked and unmistakable it may be very brief.

If the fact of recovery is once pretty clearly established, the priest will as a rule not have much difficulty in satisfying himself as to the existence of the subsequent relapse. But whatever pains he takes he will, at least without the advice of a medical man, often be in doubt about these points. And the theologians in the wake of Saint Alphonsus and Benedict XIV recommend him to repeat the anointing if he has a positive and probable reason for believing that the changes in question have taken place. And they add that this is more conformable to the old discipline of the Church, and is, besides, the means of bringing fresh spiritual assistance to the patient.

They do not, however, lay down any strict obligation in this connection. Indeed, even where the requisite changes are quite clear, they emphasize rather that it is advisable than that it is compulsory to give the Sacrament again in the same illness. Thus Lehmkuhl,²⁰ speaking of an hospital patient of this class, says it is better to re-anoint her after a year when her complaint has taken a very decided turn for the worse; but he adds that there is no strict obligation to do so.

Although it is of little practical importance, I may touch lightly on the very interesting question discussed at length by Cappello, whether re-anointing would be *valid* if it took place while the same illness and the same danger remain, or, in other words, while the patient's condition is unchanged and more or less stationary. Some, relying on the local practice obtaining in former times in certain Latin churches, and especially on the discipline of the Greek Church as a whole even before the schism, maintain that it would be valid. A remarkable argument in this sense is derived from the habit long ago of conferring the Sacrament on seven successive days. This, however, may have merely been meant as one complete administration just as the anointing of the five senses is now with us only one exercise of the sacred rite; or the repeated anointings may possibly have been only so many *sacramentals*. Those who believe in the validity of the re-anointing, while, of course, acknowledging that it is unlawful under our modern discipline, try to fortify their position by calling attention to the fact that the effects of a new anointing may well be useful—though not necessary—to do away with the

²⁰ *Casus*, II, n. 679 (3rd ed.).

remains of sin committed after the previous anointing. In any case, they say, that repeating it may be conceived to strengthen the patient's title to grace, and to give a new access of strength and consolation to his soul. Kern favours this view also Vermeersch.²¹

However, by far the more common and more probable opinion is to the effect that Extreme Unction cannot be validly—any more than lawfully—administered in the same illness and in the same danger of death. This view is based on the almost unanimous consent of theologians for several hundred years. The patrons of it also make a very strong case from the prohibition of the Church. If the Sacrament were valid in the circumstances envisaged, the Church, instead of standing in the way of its repetition, should positively and enthusiastically recommend this.

They also appeal with much apparent justification in support of their theory to a consideration of the real ends or effects of this Sacrament. For its efficacy must be held to cover, and in fact does cover, the whole period while the same danger of death lasts. It is interesting to note that this particular argument, as advanced by Cappello,²² goes to prove that Extreme Unction once received continues effective not merely for one stage or phase of an illness, but through all the varying changes of the same illness—"qualemcumque cursum sumat," as he puts it.

It is scarcely necessary to call attention to the fact that this Sacrament may not be repeated for the reason that the patient's dispositions at the time of its reception were unsatisfactory. If he had been baptized, was dangerously ill, and had the proper intention he received it validly; but its operation was retarded if his sorrow for his sins was not adequate. However, according to the common opinion, as soon as he elicits attrition or perfect contrition, as the circumstances of the case may require, and the bar to the action of the Sacrament is removed, it produces sanctifying grace and its other appropriate effects. So there is no reason for repeating it on the ground that it was in the first instance inoperative.

²¹ *Theologia Moralis*, III, n. 666 (ed. 1923).

²² *Op. cit.*, n. 267, at end.

OUR CHURCH ORGANS

By GUY WEITZ,

Chevalier de l'Ordre de la Couronne. Officier d'Académie.

OF all the musical instruments which in the past have been privileged to join their voice to those of the choir only one remains: the organ. Yet, considering the important task it has to fulfil, it is astonishing to witness how little consideration it has received from those most concerned with it. This article will deal only with the practical aspects of the subject as they are likely to come before the parochial clergy for their consideration and decision.

I. THE EXTERIOR.

Churches have been built without adequate provision for the installation of an organ and our choir lofts seldom afford sufficient room for the choristers. In one place we find the roof over the organ gallery is not sufficiently high to admit the larger pipes; or—if these can be erected at all—the space between the pipes and the roof is so limited that the sound-waves will be adversely affected by so close an obstruction. Elsewhere a too spacious window occupies the centre of the wall, leaving on either side inadequate room for a divided organ on normal lines. In both cases the organ builder is seriously handicapped; the efficiency of the organ may be lessened, but not its cost.

On the other hand, there are architects, who, while ignoring the organ, treat it as an "ensemble" with their general design and take care that the case of the organ is in harmony with the style of the building. If the architect has some practical knowledge of organs, very well; if not he will be well advised to consult an organ builder, else the design of his case may be a source of serious complications.

However, a beautiful case does not mean a good organ and from the purely musical point of view one may even challenge the necessity of a case. Its usefulness is mainly that of an ornament, but an artistic display

of the pipework might also make a pleasant picture. Imagine the effect of the various metal pipes against the larger pipes of choice woods finely polished. Then from the musical point of view would it not be a treat to hear the free and unobstructed sound from these pipes in contrast or in combination with those controlled by swell boxes?

II. THE SITE.

In our churches the organ is generally placed on a gallery at the back of the building. This may be an excellent site but it is not the only possible one, nor is it always the better; it all depends on the acoustic properties of the church. At any rate, from the liturgical point of view, and keeping in mind the slow but steady progress of church music since the famous *Motu Proprio*, logically, the organ—or rather such part of it as would suffice to accompany the choir—should be situated in or near the Sanctuary.

There are good reasons why the main body of the organ should be housed elsewhere, but if the church is of moderate length, the console—from which both sections of the organ could be played—would be most favourably placed with the choristers and choirmaster behind or on one side of the High Altar or Sanctuary. Liturgically and artistically this seems to be an ideal disposition to be aimed at; it would enable those responsible for the music to be in closer contact with the celebrant and thereby follow the ceremonies with more devotion, and would also keep the attention of the congregation concentrated on the one and only point that matters, the Sanctuary.

It may seem irrelevant to draw a comparison between the conditions of music-making in the church and in the theatre, but one cannot help wondering, in this last instance, what would be the result of removing the orchestra and the chorus a few hundred feet away from the stage, no longer left in direct contact with the principal performers.

III. THE PLACE OF THE CONSOLE.

In theory, an organ, fitted with modern electric action can be played from any distance; yet one must not forget that, whilst the electric mechanism brought into

action at the keyboard produces its effect instantly at the other end, a measurable time will elapse before the player hears the sound thus produced, because the sound travels at a much lower velocity. Experience has shown that a console situated at a great distance from the pipework is of little practical value. In these conditions the performance of contrapuntal music, such as a fugue of Bach, or that of a rich harmonic texture as are the works of César Franck, becomes artistically impossible. For the same reason extemporization has to be reduced to its simplest form; the player, unable to hear instantly the music he is actually producing, burdened with the sound of that which he has just played—perhaps in another key—is not in a position to “think ahead,” his inspiration has not the slightest chance to manifest itself, in fact it is stifled from the start. On the contrary, if the console is placed at a short distance, say no more than fifty feet, from the main body of the organ, the organist will be benefited and his task will actually be easier and more pleasant than if he were seated close to the organ.

IV. THE MECHANISM OR “ACTION.”

Some years ago, being invited to give a recital at the opening of a new organ somewhere in the North, I was informed that it was an “electric organ,” but after enquiries I found out that this “new” organ was an old one, with tracker action; all that was electric about it was the blower! Therefore—without going into technical details—I think it might be useful to explain, briefly, the various means by which the pipes of an organ are made to speak.

The essential parts of an organ are the pipes, the bellows (or the blower), the keys and the action, or mechanism by which these parts are inter-connected. From the exterior we see only the “case” (generally decorated by a display of pipes) containing pipes, feeders, etc., and the “console.” The latter contains the key-boards, draw-stops, couplers and part of the connecting mechanism commonly called the action.

The *tracker* form of action gets its name from the thin wood slips, known as trackers, by which the keys are brought in direct contact with the pipes. When a key is pressed down it moves a tracker which opens a pallet

at the foot of the pipe and admits the wind as long as the key is held in that position. Obviously this is the simplest and most practical mechanism; it is also the easiest and the least expensive to build for a small organ. If the organ is a large one, the key having to pull as many trackers as there are stops actually in use, the touch becomes excessively heavy and would be unmanageable were it not for the "Barker lever," a pneumatic appliance which takes off the greater part of the weight.

The *tubular pneumatic* system is quite different; tubes take the place of the trackers, and the pallet which admits the air into the pipe is opened by the action of the wind.

From the organ builder's point of view the pneumatic action was considered to be an improvement on account of its flexibility, but very few organists of real merit ever approved of it. It is true, the touch had become very light, but it had also lost all its crispness and sensitiveness; it was, therefore, the reverse of an improvement from the point of view of the player.

In the modern *electric* action, light cables replace the heavy metal pneumatic tubes, and electricity achieves instantly that which no amount of wind pressure could ever do.

Like a good fairy it gives satisfaction to everyone. The builder has now absolute freedom for the display of his pipework; he can apply to it any amount of heavy pressure—although he is now tempted to overdo it—at the same time the organ is relieved of a dead weight of no small amount, and the console itself becomes smaller as the system grows to perfection.

The superiority of the electric action over the pneumatic system is even more striking if the interest of the player is considered; the speech of the pipes is prompt and "clean" and there is once more crispness in the attack and release of the keys. The most complicated registration is done instantly by pressing a single piston whereby any number of stops and couplers can be brought into action. In short, the equipment of the console is now so perfect that the handling of the largest organs is easier than even the small two-manuals of old times.

V. VOICING.

So much attention has thus far been given to the action because it is nowadays the most expensive part of an organ; yet, be it tracker, pneumatic or electric, it does not affect the essence of its tone.

Tonally, the success of an organ depends to a large extent on the acoustical properties of the building in which it is placed, but essentially on the voicing of its pipes.

Voicing, an art by itself, can be roughly described as being the gift of skill to give each pipe its maximum of quality and character, but in such a way that it shall blend with any other and also that there will be perfect balance in the ensemble.

It is here that the organ builder reveals himself as a master of his craft or does not rise above the level of a business man.

Without forgetting how much the organ builders of to-day owe to the great masters of the past, whose instruments were a source of inspiration to Bach and César Franck, it can truly be said that at the present time our voicers and organ builders excel those of any other country. The work of the best of them is universally admired and, were it not for the adverse conditions of international finance, English organs would be in great demand on the other side of the Channel.

Very little need be said about the modern continental organs; they are perhaps less expensive but, with some notable and rare exceptions, they are below the standard of our own organs, and so different in many ways that they would be a drug on the British market. Moreover, those who have made the experiment will agree that a cheap organ, from whatever source, often proves to be very expensive in the long run.

VI. CHEAP ORGANS.

The misadventures due to "cheap organs" would make a long and disheartening chapter. Here is an instance: less than ten years ago a kind rector, having a little money of his own, decided to replace his wheezy harmonium by an organ. He was approached by a man calling himself an organ builder (need it be said that

his name does not appear in the Musical Directory), who boasted that he could build him an "organ" as well as any firm, only it would be much cheaper. This fatal word settled everything: an absurdly low price was agreed upon and he got the order. The successor of this rector told me how the work was begun and proceeded with, how money had to be advanced, how the price gradually rose; to cut it short, it took this man nearly two years to assemble his box of whistles.¹ He had in all received £600, but could not get his organ to work properly and when eventually he was challenged to put things right he was not to be found. An organ builder had to be called in and do what could be done and there it stands, a lamentable memorial of incompetence and ignorance. The material is odd and rough and the design is so defective that it is not worth the expenditure of rebuilding.

VII. BUYING A NEW ORGAN.

Before buying a new organ it is always advisable to obtain the advice of an expert. When no trustworthy expert is available it is safer to deal only with one of the well established firms. Prices are different as between one firm and another and this is due to several factors: the quality of the material, the workmanship of the mechanism, the skill and the reputation of the maker. Incidentally, it may be of interest to know that the price of the pipes of an organ is now reckoned at about twenty per cent. of the cost of the complete instrument, not including the casework.

There need be no fear of unpleasant surprises with qualified organ builders; visit their factories, examine their work, above all test or hear their organs. When, finally, you have come to a decision give the builder a free hand, subject to the only restriction that his estimate shall not go beyond a named figure.

One trouble to be avoided is the interference of unqualified persons in the selection of the stops, especially when the organ has to be a small one. One critic may wish to have a French Horn of the latest type, another a Vox Humana and another a Tuba, all

¹ This organ is a two manual of ten stops and one 16ft. Bourdon to the pedal.

of them ignoring the fact that it needs an organ of over thirty stops before any one of such features should be thought of. Finally, remember that it is far more satisfying to hear or to play an organ with a limited number of stops artistically voiced and well balanced, than one with twice the number of stops of indifferent character.

VIII. SECOND-HAND ORGANS.

When the necessary means to buy an organ, of adequate size for the building, are not available it may be advisable to consider the acquisition of a second-hand one. Those who are not sufficiently experienced are strongly advised to take no steps without the assistance of a trustworthy expert, otherwise the results may be disastrous. To begin with, the seller of an organ seldom forgets the price he had to pay for it and, unless there are special reasons for compelling him to dispose of it, he may ask more than its market price. From another aspect, let us suppose an organ has "pleasant tone" is this due to its intrinsic quality or is its tone enhanced by the acoustics of the building in which it stands? How old is this organ? By what firm was it built? What is the condition inside the organ? If the pipes are sound, is the mechanism an efficient system? Then, an organ cannot be dismantled and replaced like so much furniture; it will have to be overhauled and repaired before being re-erected. How much will it cost? Is it worth all this expense?

This may seem an over-cautious attitude, but in matters of such importance one has to be very prudent.

Now let me show "how not to do it" by mentioning two strange cases:

1. An organ on which I had to give a recital, had been bought from some church in the neighbourhood and re-erected, more or less in the same condition, by some local organ builder at a total cost of over £1,200. It has three manuals and about thirty stops; the reeds are blatant, the foundation stops and mixtures indifferent, the action obsolete. In short, a very unsatisfactory instrument in every way. That organ should have been left with its owners.

2. In another of our churches a three-manual of some

twenty-five speaking stops—originally built for a private residence—was bought second-hand at a total cost of over £3,000. Here the material and workmanship are good, but the specification is wrong; for instance there is only one single 8ft. Diapason for the whole organ. The Great (five stops) has, quite unnecessarily, a 4ft flute and an 8ft. dulciana, while the Choir (five stops) has a Vox Humana and a Clarinet! The Pedal section is inefficient and with the Full Organ it can scarcely be heard, its principal master stop being a Bourdon 16ft.!

The organ builders—a well-known and highly respectable firm—cannot be blamed for this; obviously they had to build the organ according to the wishes of their client. On the other hand, those who were responsible for this “bargain” ought to have known that this very firm—or any other first class organ builder—would have built them a real church organ, specially designed for their church, for no more than the price they paid for this second-hand Chamber organ.

IX. THE RENOVATION OF THE ORGAN.

The rebuilding or renovation of an organ is a delicate and difficult task for the conscientious organ builder. It is not merely a matter of replacing worn out parts as with a typewriter or a motor car, far from it. No two organs, even by the same maker, are exactly alike—nor should they be—but each has its own characteristics which show the personality of the maker. To mention his name is, in some cases, to reveal the artistic value of the instrument; to the organ lover it means as much as Guarnerius, Steinway, Rolls Royce, or some such names mean to others. In such an instance the renovation should be entrusted to the same firm—unless one has serious reason to act otherwise—in order to be sure that the “personality” of the organ shall not be interfered with.

On the other hand, take an organ—as there are many—which was originally well built, whose pipes are of excellent material, yet is tonally deficient. In this case, providing the work is put in the hands of a master, such an organ can be greatly improved and, very often, the rebuild will be greatly superior to the original. But no half-measures. The work must be done thoroughly: an incurably sluggish action should be replaced by an

electric one—this means, of course, a new console—and the builder should be left free to sacrifice any stop he finds unsatisfactory.

Old organs of inferior grade, obsolete or defective in design, are not worth expenditure on a renovation; they should be sold for what they will realize or be given away, but—never to one's friend!

X. THE MAINTENANCE OF THE ORGAN.

In the soot-laden atmosphere of great towns like London and other industrial cities organs deteriorate sooner than elsewhere. A really good organ has a long life if the climatic conditions are favourable and if proper care is given to its maintenance.

Churches are generally kept clean, but the way the cleaning is carried out is not altogether beneficial to organs. A vacuum cleaner is, of course, the best means to get rid of dust, but if the job is left to a broom—especially when the sweeper puts some energy into his work—tiny particles of soot, grit or sand are being flung into the air (who has not seen them dancing on a sunny day?) with the consequence that part of it goes into the organ, gradually choking the pipes and damaging the mechanism.

The atmosphere of the church itself has an influence which should not be overlooked; dampness is fatal, but an over-heated church is harmful, too; in fact the atmosphere of the church should retain a certain amount of moisture and a temperature of about sixty degrees Fahrenheit.

To keep an organ clean, to have it regulated and overhauled from time to time is not all; it has also to be kept well in tune. This should not be attempted by the organist or any other amateur, but left to the professional tuner. The tuning of an organ is generally arranged for by contract with the firm responsible for the building or maintenance of the organ.

Nothing is more irritating to the great majority of people than an incorrectly tuned instrument; yet it has to be admitted there are some who are not easily disturbed by out-of-tuneness. Witness the wavering intonation of some simple "Ite Missa Est" or the perilous variations of key in the singing of the Preface;

or again—to end this well in tune—listen to the experience of a very distinguished religious, sound musician and expert in the art of voice production, when he started the training of his, now famous, choir. He had obtained from his Superior the use of a suitable room; eventually he also discovered an old pianoforte, full of dust inside, and as out of tune as a garden fork. The cleaning was easily dealt with, now he went again to his Superior to be allowed to call in a tuner. “What!” was the answer. “A tuner? . . . Tuning? . . . I never heard of such a thing. . . . This piano has not been tuned since I have been here!”

HOMILETICS

BY THE REV. R. H. J. STEUART, S.J.

Passion Sunday (April 2nd).

St. John viii. 46-59.

Our Lord presents to His hearers, in support of His teaching, the evidence of His own blameless life of which they have been the witnesses, and to which He knows that in spite of their opposition to Him they dare not refuse their testimony—"He went about doing good" (Acts x. 35); "Never did man speak like this man" (John vii. 46); "I find no cause in Him" (John viii. 38). But still they would not listen to Him: therefore they are not of God.

But they pride themselves upon being God's own people: it is a blasphemy against their Fathers, from Abraham downwards, to say this of them. He must be possessed of a devil who could say it. No, says Our Lord: but *you* are in the power of the devil, for you blaspheme my Father, who is perfectly honoured in Me ("My meat is to do the will of Him who sent Me"). God, My Father, sees your wicked hearts under this show of zealous indignation, and judges you by them. I speak the words of life: there are no others ("Lord, to whom shall we go?" . . . "I am the Way"). If you accept Me for what it is plain to the simple straightforward heart that I am ("I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hidden these things from the prudent and wise and hast revealed them to little ones"), you will have that eternal life which comes to the world now only by Me ("In Him was life, and the life was the light of the world" John i. 4).

This was too much for their pride—were they not of that race of which God had said by Moses: "I will take you to myself for my people, I will be your God" (Exod. vi. 7)—and to be told that they were "not of God"! Their anger burst out into abuse which, even after all these centuries, makes us wince as we read it: He is a Samaritan, a heretic, He is possessed. At last they snatch up stones and would have killed Him there and then.

The motives which actuate the anti-Christ, anti-God effort which grows daily stronger and daily more widespread in the modern world, are, superficially at least, not the same as those which worked upon these Jews, but the power behind them is the same. It is the age-long hostility of the spirit of evil which started from that first rebellion of the angels when Lucifer fell "like lightning from heaven," and will endure without relaxation or truce or pity until this world comes to an end. Into every

detail of life, great or small, invading even its noblest and finest intimacies, there intrudes the malice of the ruined angel whose superhuman intelligence and force is bent upon one thing only, the destruction of the life of our souls, in which he finds the supreme expression of his despair and his hatred of God. The person of Christ is attacked and misrepresented and belittled: the Christian ideal is execrated as the enemy of human progress and happiness: purity, humility, self-control, obedience, prayer, faith, are derided as weakness and childishness, as positively evil things. The cumulative effect is to thrust the spiritual, the other-world, off the plane of reality and to attach the whole meaning of man's existence to his earthly life. It takes eager hold of the developments of material science, turning each new discovery and invention into one more argument against the need of anything beyond what comes under the senses. The inexplicable has no existence: there is no force but physical force and no ruler but the laws of the laboratory. And, on the moral side, there is no standard of right or wrong but one's own inclinations—God is *not* in His heaven, *therefore* all's well with the world!

Nor is it from outside only that the attack is directed. Our enemy and God's can, as we know so well, play with dire effect upon our imaginations and our desires: but he can also infect with his virus our very faith and religious practice as he had infected that of the Jews, drugging us perhaps into spiritual stagnation as being content to call ourselves Catholics without taking the trouble to understand either what that title gives us or what it asks of us. And at all costs he must keep Christ from us, that Christ Whom we cannot follow nor even truly know but at the price of labour and the endurance of pain, things which he represents to us as altogether bad. There is only one remedy for the disease with which the world grows daily more sick (and we must remember that "the world" is not an abstract entity but means our own selves as well as other selves), and that remedy is an increased personal knowledge of Christ, familiarity with His life and words and works, serious effort to grasp and hold on to Him as the one sure solution of all our puzzles and the one safe support of our belief, as God's own translation of Himself into our own modes of life and action and His supreme pattern of the life that He created us to live.

Palm Sunday.

The Passion according to S. Matthew xxvi. and xxvii.

One may say that nearly the whole of our conception of Christ centres round, is focussed into, His Passion. It is as suffering and dying for us that we picture Him most readily to ourselves—"He was wounded for our iniquities, He was bruised for our sins" . . . "by His bruises we are healed" . . . "God so loved the world"—it must therefore be of great importance

to view it rightly, and especially not to miss any method of approach which may help us to see more deeply into the mystery of it. We know that as Mother Julian of Norwich puts it: "Adam's sin was the most harm that ever was done, or ever shall be, to the world's end," for because of it we lost that supernatural elevation which placed our lives upon a level where we were fitted to possess God and enjoy Him for all eternity. This free gift was forfeited by that disobedience, and by no countervailing act of obedience on the part of any mere man, however sublime, could it be restored: the task was simply beyond all possible human competence. Yet it was in God's decree that it *should* be restored, and *by* the act of a man. What would seem to be an insoluble problem was solved by the mystery of the Incarnation whereby God Himself—the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, His Word, His Utterance, His Son—became really and truly man. As man He was thus entitled to act responsibly in the name of His race, and because He was God He had what no mere man could ever have, the power to render to God obedience of such an infinitude of perfection as (by a divine paradox) should merit as of right the return of a gratuitous gift—"Then said I, behold I come. In the head of the book it is written of me that I should do Thy will, O God" (Heb. x. 7).

But in such a world as the world was now become how would one fare who paid such perfect service to God? The growing persecution, the Passion, the Crucifixion were inevitable from the start: the Lamb was "standing as it were slain" from the first moment of His life. How often might not a little yielding of a minor principle, a venial complaisance on some small point, have saved Him suffering, perhaps in the end have averted His crucifixion? But His "Meat," that by which He lived, was "to do the will of Him who sent me," and for that perfect sinlessness there could be no other thing possible than what in fact happened. "He was offered because it was His own will" (Is. liii. 7), God's will, and His own in infinitely perfect harmony with it. And so must every true follower of Christ, every Christ-like man and woman, suffer, and it may be die, as Christ did and for the same reason.

One can follow Christ in His Passion step by step, and as S. Ignatius recommends in the *Exercises*, use all the powers of one's reason and imagination to stir up in oneself grief and love and sympathy in close union with all that He suffered. This is good, one may say that it is even necessary: but by itself alone it will hardly give us all that reality, that personal application, which the Passion of Christ should hold for us. We should look deeper still than this and remind ourselves that mystically (which is as much as to say, in God's eyes: on the Divine "plane": in *real* reality) Christ stood before His Father not only as representing and answering for us, but as identified with each of us and all of us—"I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20). By virtue of my sacramental

incorporation with Christ I "put Him on" and He "is formed in me." On that plane (I cannot understand it, but I know it) His life and sufferings were mine—it is more true, even if more confusing, to say that they *are* mine, because with God ("He who *is*") there is no time or space or number or past or future. All my suffering that has been, and all that is yet to come, pitiful though it may be, *is* the suffering of Christ: His as mine and mine as His. "I fill up in my flesh those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ" (Col. i. 24): my apprehension of them is faulty till I see them as mine too, though not on that account any the less as His.

So now I can follow Christ in His Passion in a new and more vivid way. It is *my* passion and *my* crucifixion ("With Christ am I nailed to the cross." Gal. ii. 19): it is I who, in desolation and sorrow, wander broken-hearted in the Garden and just do not break down altogether because it is Christ too, and He submitted to His Father's will that so it should be: I am scourged and made a fool of and unfairly condemned and my life brought to failure, not *like* Him only but *with* and *as* Him. I am in all Christ's Passion: and conversely, whatever pain and grief I meet with I shall be the better able to meet it patiently and nobly remembering that Christ is in all mine.

Easter Sunday.

S. Mark xvi. 1-7.

Christ is risen. His life has all through been lived in a perfect harmony and oneness with the will of His Father which has led Him, not as *a priori* one would have supposed, in peace and happiness to an honoured death, but from tribulation to tribulation, in poverty and labour and disappointment and failure and desertion, to public execution. If that were all: if all that we could say were that in spite of everything He had been faithful unto death, that would, from the finest human point of view, be much indeed ("Ah, Christ! if there were nought hereafter it still were best to follow Thee!"). He would remain forever in history as the noblest of idealists: the bravest and most patient of men: a Man of Sorrows indeed, and acquainted with infirmity, but an inspiration and a challenge to all the best that is in man and a hallowed example to those elect souls to whom the love of truth and of beauty is a supreme preoccupation. But in that case He would have failed of the work which He came to do. "If Christ be not risen again," says S. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 13), "then is our preaching vain and your faith also is vain"; and again (1 Cor. xv. 19): "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable": because in that case the life which He has brought us would not be the risen, victorious, life upon which the whole of our hope rests. He would have left us a sterling example of the life of man as God meant it to be: priceless precepts and counsels: an intimate and unmistakable revelation in our

own natural language of God as He is in Himself and as He is to us: and this alone would have sufficed to change the face of the world. But we do not go beyond the sentiment of S. Paul when we say that if this were all, if this were the whole content of His mission and the complete fulfilment of His promise, we should have misplaced our faith in Him, we should be yet in our sin, we should truly be "of all men most miserable." But since the spiritual life that we now have who are by Baptism incorporated with Christ is His very own life ("I live, now not I . . ."), and since that life is a risen life, a life which has passed beyond the reach of death—has swallowed up death in victory—we too are assured of victory without possibility of defeat so long as we consciously set our wills to live His life as He by His own voice while He was upon earth, and now by the teaching of the Church commissioned by Him to speak in His name, clearly manifests it: "Such confidence we have through Christ towards God" (1 Cor. iii. 4)!

In all our struggles, amongst the seductions of the world no less than against its opposition, under disappointment and darkness and sorrow, the uneasy whisperings of doubt and the soothing counsels of sensuality, we are certain of triumph, bound to conquer. the victory is in our hands, so long as we are trying, each according to our individual light and strength, to guide our lives by His. For then it is He who, in and as each of us, struggles and resists and seems, it may be, to fail and be overwhelmed and die, just as in His life upon earth He seemed to fail and die; but because He had defeated physical death and had risen impassible from the rock-hewn sepulchre, so now living His triumphant life in ours He turns our death into life and all defeat into victory: "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and so to enter into His glory?" (Luke xxiv. 26), not in spite of these things but because of them. To such as "put on Christ," in whom "Christ is formed," all things are translated and reversed, pain into happiness, failure into success, temptation into virtue, the cross of execution and the thorns into a throne and a crown of glory everlasting.

Low Sunday

St. John xv. 19-31.

This passage from St. John's Gospel, together with the parallel one from St. Luke's (xxiv. 36-43), are most valuable testimonies to the truth of Christ's resurrection. They exhibit the Apostles as incredulous about it: "they were troubled and frightened" says the latter, and "supposed that they saw a spirit"—not Christ truly risen, therefore, but an impalpable apparition of Him. So He made them touch Him and feel the warm human flesh of that very body which had last been seen stark and cold in death. He ate before them: the most convincing evidence that He was alive. After that there could be no more doubt: "they wondered for joy," but now they knew. St. Mark, whose infor-

mation probably came from St. Peter, tells us how there came to be food in the room. He says that Christ "appeared to the eleven as they were at table," and that He scolded them for their incredulity since they had paid no attention to the circumstantial accounts of His resurrection which had been coming in from so many quarters.

We have here none of the prerequisites of that "collective hallucination" by which unbelievers would explain these appearances of the risen Saviour. Though the Apostles *saw* Him yet they did not believe that it was really Him until their senses had contributed their combined testimony. No modern sceptic of the supernatural was ever more pragmatical than they. They went by the old principle that "seeing is believing," but when Christ condescended to this prepossession of theirs and let them see—"Handle and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me to have" (Luke xxiv. 39)—they learnt that in spiritual matters a sounder principle is that "believing is seeing." "Faith," says the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 1), "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not." The supernatural gift of faith brings to us a degree of certainty as to the truths that we hold which is firmer and more indefectible than even the overwhelming certitude of mathematical deductions, just because the motive upon which we believe is the authority of Him who created reason. *Therefore*, "Blessed are they that have not seen but have believed" (John xx. 29), because their belief rests not upon the fallible evidence of sense nor upon the restricted authority of reason, but upon the word of Him who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Only by this faith are we able to bear with the problems and trials of life and to hold to it, despite what looks like irrefragable evidence to the contrary, that God has for each of us and for all of us no other thing than love, and that this is the motive of all that He does or permits to happen to us.

How hard it is to hold to this in the midst of the picture of unmanageable chaos that even the most ordinary human life seems so often to present! Indeed "How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out" (Rom. xi. 31)! In the comprehension of God's ways and "judgments" we stand to Him in little better case than the lower animals do to ourselves. They understand (to use the word) so much of our ways as are more or less common to us both, such as anger, fear, joy, pain. But what is distinctly human, as thought, generalization, art, is absolutely and forever beyond their utmost scope. So, then, too, as between us and God. I do not understand because I cannot understand. If God were no more than a larger man I could not, indeed, justify His management of the world. But just because I have what no lower order of creation has, the power, namely, of recognizing an order above my own, I am able to believe, and to find rest and comfort in believing that in that order, in God's Order where

alone is reality, all is right and all is best and all is love. "See," said Our Lord to Mother Julian, "See! I am God: see! I am in all thing: see! I lift never my hands off my works, nor ever shall without end: see! I lead all thing to the end I ordained it to from without beginning, by the same might, wisdom, and love whereby I made it. How should anything be amiss?" (Chap. xl.).

Second Sunday after Easter.

S. John x. 11-16

Never in the history of the world had a man made such claims for himself as this Man made. Well might Pilate, stupefied by the immensity of these claims even as they appeared to his sceptic and pagan mind, cry (like Caiphas, prophesying without knowing it) "Ecce Homo"—"What a Man!" we might paraphrase it.

In verses eleven to eighteen of the chapter from which the Gospel of this Sunday is taken, Christ says, equivalently, that all the human race is His, that life and death are at His call, that He and God are one. "A dissension rose," continues S. John (vv. 19-21), "among the Jews for these words, and many of them said: He hath a devil and is mad [He must be, for 'He made Himself the Son of God' (John xix. 7)] why hear ye Him? Others said: These are not the words of one that hath a devil. Can a devil open the eyes of the blind?" It is not until men's eyes are opened, till they see that this Man who not only seemed to be but really was truly a man, was yet as truly God, so that the least of His precepts and promises is a *creative* thing—a thing that *does* what it says—that they truly apprehend and validly accept Christ. "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want: He hath set me in a place of pasture: He leadeth me beside the still waters: He refresheth my soul: He guideth me on the way of righteousness for His Name's sake: Yea, though I should walk in the midst of the valley of the shadow of death, yet will I fear no evils for Thou art with me" (Psalm xxii.).

He knows His and His know Him. He is God *made* man, not God *acting* man as the Archangel Raphael acted "Azarias the son of the great Ananias." There is no detail of human experience, no joy and no sorrow, that is not now, to those who are "His own," a holy, a redemptive, a divine thing. To him who rightly apprehends the mystery of the Incarnation, of that great Deed by which the reality of all creation is revealed as God's utterance of Himself, as His Word spoken in every language and dialect, everything *looks like* God, everything says "God" before it says its own name. To him God is in all creation as the voice of the singer is in his song. So all the puzzles and anomalies of life seem to him no longer things that call for explanation but things already clearly

explained ; and the explanation ("*Solutio omnium quaestionum*") is Christ.

"Behold, I am with you all days [and in all things] even to the consummation of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 20).

"Lord to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life" (John vi. 69). To whom, indeed? For, "this is eternal life, that they should know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ Whom Thou has sent" (John xvii. 3).

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. PHILOSOPHY.

BY THE REV. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

The most considerable book that I find in my list is *Perception*, by H. H. Price, B.Sc., M.A.¹ As the author tells us in the Preface: "it is concerned in the main with only two points, the nature of percipient consciousness and the relation of sense data to the ordinary 'macroscopic objects' of daily life, such as tables and rocks." But these two points are developed in great detail and with a welcome freshness of outlook.

The first chapter is devoted to "The Given." Sense-data are the starting point of the enquiry. Sense-datum is a "neutral term" the significance of which the author describes as follows: "When I am in the situation which is described as seeing something, touching something, hearing something, etc., it is certain in each case that a colour-patch, or a pressure, or a noise exists at that moment and that I am acquainted with this colour-patch, pressure or noise. Such entities are conveniently called sense-data" (p. 18).

In the second chapter "Naïve Realism" is examined. The usual arguments are expressed and evaluated with a fullness and clearness beyond anything that I have met elsewhere, and they will well repay the student's close attention. Mr. Price shows the inadequacy of the ordinary Causal and Phenomenological objections against naïve realism. He examines with much respect the "Selective Theory," which is to the effect that a material object is nothing more than a group of sensibilia. He concludes that neither Naïve Realism nor the Selective Theory is tenable, that sense-data are somato-centric, and, further, that they exist only in the somato-centric complex.

In dealing with the nature of sense-data the author diverges into Metaphysics, and his discussion of such topics as Surface, Space and Place, though ingenious and penetrating, lacks the precision which, in spite of differences of view, characterizes the treatment of the same subjects by the Scholastics. He maintains that all sense-data which are not hallucinations are united with external objects as also they are related to minds. But it does not follow that mind and matter *consist* of sense-data.

In Chapters VI and VII are analysed the grounds of the ordinary man's conviction regarding the existence and character of material things. According to Mr. Price, this begins with a simple perceptual acceptance, which involves the taking for granted of the existence of a material thing to which the sense-

¹ Methuen & Co., Ltd. pp. 332+vii. 12s. 6d.

datum perceived belongs. This is followed by a second stage, perceptual assurance, which "is a rational conviction of the existence of a material thing having a certain determinable character" (p. 203), and this is "quite sufficient for all the purposes of science and of daily life." This "assurance" depends upon the acceptance of a series of related sense-data which form a "family."

The relation of belonging-to which exists between sense-data and matter is finally resolved into the recognition of the identity of matter with a "complete" thing, consisting of the physical portion of the thing and the family of sense-data which delimit or coincide with it, so that "we can and must say that secondary qualities no less than primary ones are qualities of matter, nor could there possibly be a piece of matter which did not possess them."

Obviously this is not one of those "popular" philosophical essays which flood the market nowadays; but the severity of the treatment is relieved by a pawky humour which will allure the serious student, who, in the end, though he may disagree with the author's findings will be grateful for the clarity of his restatement of an old problem and the thoroughness of his criticism of many proposed solutions.

Under the title "*On the Power of God*" the English Dominican Fathers have produced a volume in continuation of their translation of St. Thomas and uniform with the volumes of the *Summa Theologica*. Here the first three questions of the *De Potentia Dei* are translated in a well printed volume of about 250 pages.² The translator is Fr. Lawrence Shapcote, O.P., S.T.L., who (as we are told in the Introduction) "has also been the sole translator of the *Summa Theologica* and of the *Summa Contra Gentiles*"—surely an outstanding feat of devotion and industry. The Introduction by Fr. Gilbey, O.P., describing the nature of the *Quaestiones Disputatae* and contrasting them with the *Quodlibetales* is brief but satisfying. The English province is to be congratulated on thus bringing the works of St. Thomas before the wider public which is now beginning to show an interest in them.

Professor J. B. S. Haldane's book, *The Causes of Evolution*,³ is a defence of the Natural Selection theory based on modern genetical knowledge and mathematical considerations.

His first chapter is a readable and clear account of the history of evolution and of its various theories. On the third page he writes: "The rising generation of biologists, to which I belong, may now perhaps claim to make its voice heard. We have this advantage at least over our predecessors, that we get no thrill from attacking either theological or biological orthodoxy; for eminent theologians have accepted evolution and eminent biologists denied natural selection." So there are drawbacks

² Burns, Oates & Washbourne. 7s. 6d.

³ Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd. pp. 234+vii. 7s. 6d.

to the progress of enlightenment: these eminent bishops and deans have deprived the youngsters of their thrill. Well, there is perhaps no promise of a thrill to disturb the balance of their judgment, but a little spice of malice would seem to creep in even yet; there are Daytonians still in the pulpit, for the "text" of our first chapter runs: "'Darwinism is dead'—*Any Sermon*"; and, again, on the second page: "The few really pertinent attacks [on Evolution before Darwin's death] were lost amid a jabber of ecclesiastical bombinations." However, though I for one cannot accept his conclusions, I think that the author has presented the case for evolution with an adherence to fact and a clearness of judgment which are rare. And, writing about natural selection with authority because he is "one of the three people who know most about its mathematical theory," he allows that many of his readers know enough about evolution to justify them in passing value judgments upon it "which may differ from his."

In Chapter II the author gives an account of Variation within the Species. He warns the general reader unacquainted with Biology against devoting too much attention to this chapter and the next. But the two are well worth a careful study by anyone who is really interested in Evolution. The most necessary warning would seem to be that even when the author is not professedly mathematical there is a mathematical turn to his thought and reasoning which will prove troublesome to the non-mathematical mind.

In his fourth chapter on Natural selection, Professor Haldane describes the ways in which rapid evolutionary jumps may take place. This seems to me to be the most important consideration for those who are anxious to frame an acceptable theory of the evolution of man's body. The disbelief in such a possibility is one of the chief *scientific* arguments against the neo-Darwinian account.

The later chapters, which provide easier reading, present an application of theory to many of the concrete questions which arise and to some of the fallacies which have accrued about evolution. A long appendix is devoted to the strictly mathematical treatment of Natural Selection.

There is no doubt that the "new morality" is having a thoroughly bad press just now. The latest attack comes from the pen of Mr. Philip S. Richards who has written a very sound book⁴ presenting the case against "Naturalism" in a novel and intriguing manner. His central thesis is not perhaps quite obvious at first sight and I am not quite sure that Canon Quick in his Preface has sufficiently elucidated it. In his eagerness to welcome a defence of the humanist tradition the writer of the Preface leaps at the humanist form and by comparison neglects the content. Lost in admiration of the trees he seems to think little of the wood. He is not unaware of it: "It is the

⁴ *Belief in Man*. By Philip S. Richards. (S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d. pp. 193, xxvii.)

classical tradition which is the champion not only of verbal logic, but also of the validity and truthfulness of the old ideals, which common words alone can make the subject of discourse." But it is precisely the validity and truthfulness of the old ideals upon which Mr. Richards is insisting, and which are the basis of his argument for man's uniqueness in a discontinuous nature, with the rejection of naturalism as a corollary.

This intellectual segregation of man from the rest of creation is worth accomplishing for its own sake in these days when Psycho-analysis, Behaviourism, the "New Morality," and the Comparative study of Religions are all engaged in emphasizing man's kinship with the beasts from which he is supposed to have evolved by a discontinuous process, with the further view of discrediting traditional morality so as to release human nature from its artificial restraints. Mr. Richards meets this with a positive thesis: "Our object all along has been to defend and justify a particular conception of human nature as a whole—a conception which we may briefly summarize by saying that a man, wherever he is found, is essentially the same; a moral and rational being, with a sense of beauty and a natural propensity for religion."

But though this is his main object, by implication and parenthesis he accomplishes more than that. As Canon Quick says: "Let no one hastily imagine from his title that he would oppose 'belief in man' to belief in God. On the contrary he indicates, as I think persuasively, that classical humanism can only be justified in the end by the faith that man is made in God's image, and that the Incarnation is the climax of the creation" (p. ix.).

Mr. Richards sums up an excellent chapter on the Limits of Evolution in these words: "The evolutionary theory, in any sense in which it is either coherent or true, cannot impair the reality of human values; in any sense in which it is hostile to human values, it is demonstrably untrue and self-contradictory." He then sets out to show that "in certain human characteristics the process of evolution has definitely reached its term, for the simple but insuperable reason that they are absolute: in other words that development cannot, in any given direction, go any further" (p. 20).

Conscience is such an absolute. The Evolution of Morals is criticized and refuted in the second chapter: "Conscience is of such a nature that it cannot conceivably have been evolved, in any legitimate sense of the word, from something that was not consciousness" (p. 43). So, too, reason, which is "the special prerogative of man; the endowment which indefeasibly separated *homo sapiens* from the rest of the animal kingdom and marked him out as the Lord of creation" (p. 58).

Another exclusively human attribute is the instinct for religion. The naturalists do not deny that man alone presents any evidence of religion; they are content to say that in man this sense of religion is a delusion. In his refutation of this

assertion Mr. Richards approves the statement that there is no alternative to naturalism except supernaturalism—a most important doctrine in these days when an Anglican Bishop wants to purge religion of every trace of the supernatural. A full belief in man implies a belief in God: “to be irreligious is to fall short of typical and complete manhood.”

In the Classics, about which Mr. Richards writes with the conviction and enthusiasm of the scholar we find not only an insistence on the unchanging values of human nature but a revelation of a new “absolute”: a perfection of poetry unsurpassed and unsurpassable.

This is altogether a fascinating and valuable book. The author writes as a “Catholic” *tout court*. At times sympathetic Catholic eyebrows will rise until they are notes of interrogation, but usually they will subside again in recognition of a possible benevolent interpretation. The S.P.C.K. is to be congratulated on the attractive form in which the book is produced. I have noticed one regrettable misprint and I cannot help wondering who was the “scientist” who told the author that “the atom is a certain arrangement of positive and negative units called ions and electrons.” But these are trifles which do not detract from the merit of the book as a whole.

Mr. Bertrand Russell is a conspicuous object of attack in another new book.⁵ The “new morality” is devised to free sex from all restraints and inhibitions. The family has to go, interest in children as offspring has to go, marital fidelity has to go. The double standard of sex conduct, iniquitously accepted for so long, must be submitted to a levelling process: not by any condemnation of masculine delinquencies but by condonation or encouragement of the practice of promiscuity by women.

Upon all this disgusting propaganda of lust Mr. Newsom has made a reasoned attack. The defect of his method is over seriousness: not for a moment that such things should be treated lightly, but that one sometimes feels that more effective than a careful examination would be a curt and scornful dismissal of a thesis so flagrantly opposed to common sense and elementary decency. I fear that on reading some of these pages the new pagan may take to himself the unholy glee of a successful “rise,” or even “leg-pull.” Another drawback to the effectiveness of the book is the author’s too copious use of *oratio recta* (with or without the irritating display of inverted commas) in reporting opinions, with the consequent embarrassment of distinguishing these from Mr. Newsom’s own views.

Still, the work is to be commended as a victorious rejection of any claim to a moral philosophy on the part of those whose efforts are directed to the annihilation of traditional moral values

⁵ *The New Morality*. By the Rev. G. E. Newsom. (Ivor Nicholson & Watson, Ltd. 319 pp. 6s.)

and the disintegration of family life. Catholics, of course, cannot echo the praise, faint as it may be, of the famous Lambeth decision about Birth Control. But the book shows high moral purpose, and wide knowledge of the subject matter, with a sound basis of experience in social work.

II. HISTORY.

BY THE REV. PHILIP HUGHES, L.S.Hist.

It is good news that Mgr. Bardenhewer has come at last to the completion of his great Patrology. Messrs. Herder announce it from Freiburg.¹ It divides into three great divisions. First of all we have the last centuries of Greek Patrology from Leontius of Byzantium to St. John Damascene. Next there is a valuable section on the golden age of Armenian theology. Finally the Latins from St. Leo to St. Isidore of Seville. The abundance of erudition, the sure, balanced, judgment, the clear exposition that distinguished the previous volumes are present once again. This great work is as usable as it is scientific, and it is one of the glories of Catholic scholarship.

The Columban Church, by John Duke,² is a scholarly study from original sources of the churches which owed their foundation, directly or indirectly, to St. Columba. It is the story of Iona and of Lindisfarne. It is, however, to be regretted that the learned author exaggerates, or rather misconceives, the nature of these churches' "independence" of Rome, and from their undoubted peculiarities of ritual and organization draws quite unwarrantable conclusions. Major Hay, if he brings out a new edition of his famous *Chain of Error in Scottish History*, will be able to add contemporaries to his list of bygone victims.

The CLERGY REVIEW for February, 1932, noted, none too favourably, the volume of Messrs. Methuen's new *History of Europe*, which deals with the century of the Reformation. The latest volume of the series to appear is by Mr. W. T. Waugh.³ It deals with the fifteenth century (1378-1494), and once more the reader searching in the past for explanation of the present cannot but be disappointed.

It may be admitted that the period this book describes is one with little attraction. The marvellous revival of civilization whose crowning wonder was St. Thomas Aquinas is spent. The violent soul-moving catastrophe of the age of Trent is yet to come. Between the two is this century of decadence, of irresolute mediocrity, of abortive schism, abortive rebellion, abortive restoration and reform. The Papacy, returned from Avignon, fights a terrible struggle with schism, and with a theory of

¹ Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur. Vol. V. Die letzte Periode der altkirchlichen Literatur mit Einschluss des ältesten armenischen Schrifttums. pp. 423. 9 marks.

² Oxford University Press. pp. 200. 10s.

³ Methuen. pp. 543. 16s.

Church government bred of the schism which would ultimately destroy Catholicism's very essence. In that seventy year's struggle the Papacy is indeed victorious. But the struggle was forced on the Papacy when the Papacy was already weak, resourceless and, once again, too much at the mercy of the lay state. Victory found it wounded nigh to death. This—the effect on the central institution of Christendom of Christendom's refusal to be Catholic in matters social and political—is the essence of the fifteenth century tragedy. It is the first grave weakness of Mr. Waugh's interesting and informative book that it fails to see this.

The story of the Papacy is indeed told but it is told among a multitude of other stories and as of no more importance than any of the rest. Whereas it is the key to the whole complicated affair. Whoever writes the history of the Middle Ages writes Church History, and the author of a general history of mediæval Europe who fails to write it around the fortunes of the Church fails signally as a historian. This is, of course, no matter of the writer's own religious beliefs—it is simply the technical question of the right ordering of facts. Where facts are not rightly ordered the record, though it may escape chaos, lacking unity, fails of its essential purpose. It cannot be more than a repertoire of facts and "facts themselves are dumb."

The matter is important because this book is one of a series whose aim is to fill a gap long vacant in the student's library. It deals with one of the critical periods, a period whose events are still moving life, and to which can be traced the origin of more than one of the ideas that still trouble mankind's peace. And the series will be for years to come a kind of standard text-book from which undergraduates will "get up" the general background of their studies, and the over-worked masters in secondary schools prepare their history lessons.

We might add—it is really of less importance—that the author's dislike for Catholicism (to which he is, of course, entitled) shows itself continually and needlessly. St. Joan of Arc is the St. Joan of the much talked-of play. Our Henry VI is "saintly and weak-minded." An emperor is "upright and just though inordinately pious." As for the popes of the period—no Catholic is proud of some of them, but it can be recognized that they represent the time which produced them, and that they are the last far-felt effect of the triumph of princely absolutism over the earlier mediæval conception of a Christendom obedient to the voice of God expressed through the Church. In them is renewed the plague from which St. Gregory VII freed the Church and from which his successors kept it free by endless uncompromising war on the Catholic princes who rebelled against their leadership. The last of these great champions of spiritual independence was the much calumniated Boniface VIII, and the "secularized" papacy of the seventy years before Luther was the natural result of Boniface VIII's defeat. Anti-papal historians cannot have it every way. The

unpleasantness we piously deplore to-day is very often the result of the unpleasantness which, blinded by pre-judgment, we yesterday hailed as progress and gain.

A few quotations to end this note. Of Boniface IX (1389-1404): "To contemporaries his most astonishing characteristic was his chastity"—a vaguely reported piece of gossip, handy to blacken a character and enliven a dull page, given without any hint of provenance, but History . . . ? Innocent VII, his successor, to check the spread of Wycliffe's doctrines in Bohemia "tried to stop the growing practice of frequently receiving the Communion." Against which we write, admitting fully that the author does not understand his sources, *suggestio falsi*. Of Nicholas V and the fall of Constantinople: "The Pope was not specially to blame." Comment would spoil this. Pius II's youth is as well known as that of St. Augustine. So also is his conversion. Mr. Waugh records both faithfully and with his own Kingsley-like candour, adds: "He seems, while Pope, to have refrained from the grosser sins of the flesh" . . . those no doubt of which Mr. Waugh would not approve. Innocent VIII, in the days when he was a typical man about town and with no thought of becoming a cleric, became the father of two children. Upon which Mr. Waugh builds as follows: "His chief title to renown is that he was the first pope who openly acknowledged his children. Their precise number is uncertain; but it is pleasing to be assured that at least two, though illegitimate, were begotten before their father took orders." Nor is Mr. Waugh at a loss when he discovers a pope against whose chastity even he can find nothing. Such a one was the fiery crusader from Spain, Calixtus III. "Historians have dwelt complacently on the purity of this aged man's private life; but he seems to have had a full share of the headstrong cantankerousness and self-satisfied unscrupulousness that so often accompany old-age." Nasty Mr. Waugh. And what, after it all, will students get from him more than they can get from the work of his predecessors?

Miss Decima Douie's *The Nature and the Effect of the Heresy of the Fraticelli*⁴ is a learned and admirably written study of a question in which all mediævalists are interested. She traces from its origins the history of the "Spirituals" in St. Francis's great family and, fairly and impartially, describes the discussions, the conflicts which filled so much of the Order's first century. Next she studies the influence exercised upon the Franciscan Order by that literally portentous personage, the Cistercian Abbot Joachim of Flora. He had foretold a coming new age, the age of the Holy Ghost. One of its signs would be a new order of religious, and the Franciscans seemed to fulfil his vision to the letter. Then a Franciscan friar wrote a commentary on Abbot Joachim—*An Introduction to the Eternal Gospel*. His exposition, or more likely the evidence

⁴ Manchester University Press. pp. 202.

that exposition was of the mischief latent in the hitherto uncondemned theories, provoked a storm. The book was condemned and thenceforward "Joachimism" was among the heresies. In one shape or another it persisted, allied always in its adepts to great austerity of life. It persisted among the Franciscans and its persistence was a cause of new sorrows to the Order. There follow three absorbing chapters on the three great leaders of the "Spirituals," Angelo da Clareno, Peter John Olivi and Ubertino da Casale. Then after an account of the terrible fights with Pope John XXII on the question of Our Lord's Poverty, we come to the Fraticelli themselves and a sketch of the literary fruit of the long discussions.

As Dr. Douie says: "the struggle between [the Spirituals] and the Conventuals was fraught with momentous implications not only for the Franciscan Order but for the whole Church, giving rise to endless speculations on the basis of the claims of religious authority." Few writers have dealt with this subject with the tact that Miss Douie shows. Her book is admirably indexed, there is abundant reference to sources, and—a mercy indeed in a book on anything Franciscan—it is free from sentimentalities.

A third work which deals with this period of the Decline of the Empire and the Papacy is the recently published seventh volume of the *Cambridge Mediæval History*.⁵ This is the last volume but one of this well-known encyclopædia of reference. It is, of course, too vast to be examined in these notes.

The Treasure of San Roque, by W. Telfer, M.A.,⁶ is indeed an unusual book. Its sub-title describes it as "a sidelight on the Counter-Reformation." It describes how through the piety of different Spanish noblemen, men of State, men of affairs, there was built up one of the world's great collections of relics. The date of the story is the time which saw the preparations for the Spanish Armada. The story is indeed striking testimony to the very real personal piety and zeal for the things of God which at that time undoubtedly inspired the Spanish effort in the Counter-Reformation—piety and zeal at the Court of the Emperor no less than at Lisbon and Madrid. In Mr. Telfer's study a whole world of long-forgotten notables comes to life again, and the Counter-Reformation is seen as a reaction against the Reformation conceived as an attack upon piety and spirituality.

III. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

If we believe the Breviary lessons for October 9th, Dionysius the Areopagite, St. Paul's convert (Acts xvii. 34), became the first bishop of Athens, but later was sent by St. Clement I

⁵ 50s.

⁶ S.P.C.K. pp. 222. 8s. 6d.

to Gaul where he founded the see of Paris and died a martyr's death; "he wrote admirable and truly heavenly books, on the Divine Names, on the Heavenly and on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, on Mystical Theology, and certain other books." It has long been known that three persons are here confused: the real Areopagite, first bishop of Athens; Dionysius of Paris, a third century Gallic martyr; and the unknown author of the writings named in the Breviary. It is the last mentioned person who will engage our attention, because his works have had such an influence in both the East and the West as to win for their author the title of Father of Christian Mysticism. His period, though not his personal identity, was established about forty years ago by the independent researches of Frs. Hugo Koch and Joseph Stiglmayr, S.J., to whose conclusions the best scholars, both Catholic and non-Catholic, adhered. He was proved to belong, not to the first century of our era, but to the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth. His writings are of a time when monasticism was already flourishing and organized, and they show considerable dependence on the neo-Platonic philosopher, Proclus, who lived from A.D. 411 to 485, and they mention the singing of the Credo at Mass, a practice introduced at Antioch by the Monophysite Patriarch, Peter Fullo, in A.D. 476, and adopted only later by the Catholics. On the other hand, they were in existence before A.D. 533, because at the Conference of Constantinople in that year they were produced by the Severian Monophysites as apostolic confirmation of their doctrine, but rejected by the Catholics as spurious on the ground that they were obviously unknown to St. Cyril of Alexandria and to the Fathers generally. The author of the writings appears to have been, in fact, an adherent of the Henoticon of A.D. 482; his works are first found in the hands of Monophysites, and he always seems careful to avoid speaking of one or two natures in our Blessed Lord. Syria rather than Egypt would appear to be his locality.

It has not yet, however, been possible to discover a distinguished intellectual, deeply mystical and still Monophysite in tendency, pertaining to the period in question, who could with real probability be regarded as the pseudo-Dionysius. The matter is at the moment creating considerable discussion on the Continent. The veteran Dionysian scholar, Fr. Joseph Stiglmayr, in two articles in *Scholastik* during 1928, maintained the identity of his subject with the founder of Severian or moderate Monophysitism himself, Severus, Patriarch of Antioch.¹ He argues from the close similarity which he considers that he has established between their lives and characters. Severus was trained first at Alexandria in philosophy and rhetoric and then turned with ardour to a life of prayer and asceticism, nourishing his mind and his spirit on the writings of the great Fathers

¹ For my information on this discussion I am indebted to an article in *Echos d'Orient*, Oct.-Déc., 1932: Les Derniers Essais d'Identification du Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite, by G. Stéphaneou.

and of St. Paul, whose fervent disciple he was. So, too, was the pseudo-Dionysius deeply versed in the neo-Platonism of Alexandria; and he was a soul devoted to mortification and mystical prayer; and he also like Severus was a fervent disciple of the Fathers and St. Paul. Again, Severus was a political Monophysite, defender of the Henoticon; and in that also, the pseudo-Dionysius is like him. Moreover, Severus's circle of friends have the characteristics of the disciples of St. Paul who figure in the pages of the Areopagite. And so on. Such is the line of Fr. Stiglmayr's argument.

The attempt at identification was soon contested by other scholars, especially by M. Lebon of Louvain, the foremost Severian authority of the day. M. Lebon will not admit the parallel between Severus of Antioch and pseudo-Dionysius. Point by point he shows how Fr. Stiglmayr has misconstrued the character of Severus. The Monophysite leader was not a mystic; yet Fr. Stiglmayr makes a great point of his mysticism throughout his comparative study. Nor again are the entourage of Severus and the Areopagite really identical. To take the most striking case, Peter of Cæsarea, in the life of Severus, is regarded by Fr. Stiglmayr as the Timothy of pseudo-Dionysius, best beloved of all his friends and followers. But for Peter of Cæsarea Severus is not known from his biography to have had any particular affection nor to have exercised over him any special directive influence. Further, in the view of M. Lebon the patristic knowledge of Severus and of Dionysius are not closely akin.

Thus M. Lebon controverts Fr. Stiglmayr along the whole line of his argument. The matter did not rest, and a keen discussion arose between the protagonists, into which other experts have been drawn. Mgr. Bardenhewer, the distinguished patristic scholar, supports M. Lebon; Harnack admitted the possibility of identifying Severus and Dionysius, but said that he could not resist the impression that Dionysius was slightly anterior to Severus.

Another attempt to identify Dionysius comes from the Orthodox Greek Church. Mgr. Athenagoras, ex-Metropolitan of Paramythia in Epirus, removes him from the fifth to the third century and tries to prove him to be the great St. Dionysius of Alexandria. The thesis is not entirely new, since it was put forward in 1875 by Skworzow;² but Mgr. Athenagoras has arrived at it independently. He argues that the Areopagite was a man of high philosophical and theological attainment and could therefore only belong to a peak period of Christian thought. Such a period is found in Alexandria in the third century. For Alexandria at that time was a centre of the richest neo-Platonic philosophy; mysticism was in its atmosphere; and its famous schools, the Didascaleion and the Catechetical School, sheltered a goodly company of first-rate scholars. The Areopagite dwells

² See *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, IV, 431.

affectionately on his master in mysticism. Mgr. Athenagoras believes this master to be Clement of Alexandria, who died between A.D. 215 and 220, when St. Dionysius would be twenty-five or thirty years old; he bases his view on the intellectual pre-eminence of Clement and on certain phrases and ideas of Clement which find their counterpart in the Areopagitic writings. To explain the false attribution of the works of St. Dionysius of Alexandria to his namesake of the Areopagus, Mgr. Athenagoras supposes that the books were at first anonymous or circulated only among the writer's intimate circle, among whom, as we know, were men with apostolic baptismal names, and that afterwards, following the vicissitudes of a century or two, they became publicly known and were ignorantly ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite through the similarity of names in them and in the circle of St. Paul.

The proofs of this theory are not very substantial. It is admitted that if it became impossible to maintain a late fifth century Syrian origin for the Dionysian writings, the third century and Alexandria would merit immediate attention as the date and place of their birth. But as yet the critics still hold to the conclusions of Koch and Stiglmayr, and Mgr. Athenagoras has not really met the arguments from the doctrine and general character of the writings on which those conclusions were based.

The first fascicle of the long expected *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*³ has at last appeared. It covers the ground, *Aa* to *Allemande* (*Spiritualité*). This first instalment quite fulfils the projected aim of the *Dictionnaire* by giving an account of all the more important spiritual authors and treating at proportional length of all the main historical and doctrinal questions. The English Saint Aelred figures among the longer articles on authors, but his latest life, a charming and scholarly work by T. Edmund Harvey,⁴ is not included in the bibliography. About forty writers of the pastoral and regular clergy have collaborated in the fascicle. Aiming at being entirely Catholic, the *Dictionnaire* gives due prominence to the conflicting views that are tenable on any subject matter: thus the article on *Accroissement des Vertus* presents both the Thomist and the Suarezian theories written by a competent author of each school. The care that has gone to the composition of the *Dictionnaire* is shown by the inclusion of a short notice of John Alcock (c. 1430-1500), founder of Jesus College, Cambridge, and of the ornate chantry at Ely Cathedral, whose spiritual writings are almost forgotten.

³ Paris: Beauchesne, 20 francs.

⁴ London: H. R. Allenson, Ltd., 5s.

MORAL CASES

DIVORCE CO-OPERATION.

Inasmuch as civil divorce is on the increase in every country of the world, it would be interesting to know the state of theological opinion with regard to the lawfulness of assisting in these proceedings in the capacity of judge, counsel, etc.

REPLY.

The question raised is a large one and it is difficult to answer it adequately in the space at my disposal. We may confine it to reasonable limits by passing over the question of co-operation on the part of petitioners and lesser officials, and confining ourselves to the position of the judge, which is really the crux of the whole matter. As in every question of co-operation in evil, the point at issue is whether the pronouncement of a civil divorce is *intrinsically* evil. If it is, then we cannot tolerate it for any reason whatever. If it is not, it may be tolerated *remoto scandalo*, etc., in certain given circumstances. The first inclination of any Catholic, whether he is a theologian or not, is on the side of regarding such an action as *intrinsically* evil. It appears to be an attempt to set aside the natural law by which marriage is indissoluble, a law solemnly reaffirmed by Christ and inflexibly maintained by the Church. The very fine answers given by that staunch Catholic, Judge Arthur O'Connor, K.C., before the *Royal Commission on Divorce* in 1912, are worth recording again: "I am a Catholic and therefore I do not recognize that there is any authority in any human tribunal to dissolve a marriage once validly contracted."

QUESTION: "Would you say . . . the stipendiary magistrate would be a more suitable person than the County Court Judge. . . ?"

"My mind cannot entertain the idea of anybody being a suitable person."

QUESTION: "Do you consider that it is within the range of practical politics to get the Act of 1857 repealed?"

"That reminds me of a passage of a judgment very recently given by a Lord Justice of Appeal: 'The wisdom of one Parliament may seem folly to the next and the declaration of the former may be set aside by the latter, and yet the law of God remains unchanged and unchangeable.'"

QUESTION: "The State has recognized (I do not say the Church) that divorce should be open to all classes of the community."

"Yes, but if an Act of Parliament were passed conferring on me jurisdiction and authority to declare a marriage dissolved, I should have to regard it as I should an Act that purported to repeal the Ten Commandments."

QUESTION: "... Ought not all classes to have the advantage of obtaining the benefits that that law confers?"

"That is assuming they are benefits. . . . If such an Act of Parliament as is suggested were passed, it would take some time to pass it, I suppose, and by that time I might be considerably more fit for the retired list than anything else; but if I were not I am afraid there would be a vacancy on the County Court Bench."¹⁹

The doctrine so ably expressed by this old Ushaw boy is the doctrine of most of the older theologians and, notably, of Cardinal Gasparri.²⁰ It is expressed in many instructions of the Holy See²¹ and has everything to recommend it, in ordinary circumstances.

Nevertheless, even though the doctrine is expounded with a certain misgiving, it must be remembered that, in the teaching of other authorities, including most of the modern manualists, the pronouncement of a civil divorce is not an intrinsically evil action. It gives scandal, so grave that the Church has at various times absolutely forbidden it; it opens to the divorced parties the occasion of a sinful adulterous union; most of all, it appears openly to flout the moral law and centuries of Christian tradition. How, then, can we avoid concluding that it is intrinsically evil? By distinguishing between the bond of marriage which is indissoluble by the natural law and the civil effects which are at the disposition of the civil ruler. The judge, in pronouncing a decree, dissolves the civil effects of marriage, but *the vinculum remains*, and if the parties use their civil freedom to contract a second adulterous union the sin is on their conscience alone. This distinction was rejected by the Holy See in an answer to the French Bishops, May 27th, 1886,²² but it was declared a few months later by the Belgian Nuncio that the answer was not meant to apply to Belgium.²³ Also, an answer of the Sacred Penitentiary to the Bishop of Luçon in the following year favours the liberal interpretation.²⁴ What appears at first sight, to be a series of conflicting instructions is quite easily explained if it is remembered that the replies necessarily took into account the

¹⁹ Minutes, Vol. II, 12354—12389.

²⁰ De Matrimonio, §1554.

²¹ Cf. Vacant, *Dict. Theol.*, IV, col. 1475.

²² Gasparri: *Fontes*, IV, n. 1101.

²³ De Smet: *De Matrimonio*, §398, n. 1.

²⁴ The text of these Roman decisions are conveniently grouped together in Gougard, *De Matrimonio*, 1931, p. 318.

localities and circumstances of various places. If the Holy See could rely on every judge in Christendom being of the calibre of Judge O'Connor, then, without a doubt, the granting of civil divorce decrees would have been universally forbidden. But, on reflection, it can be seen that there exist the gravest reasons why the action should sometimes be tolerated; the reasons are not only those of a private nature, affecting the material good of individual judges, but reasons affecting the public good as well. If the action is gravely and intrinsically wrong, it might mean, in some places, that the judicial bench would be closed to every Catholic.

The answer to the question, therefore, is that modern theological opinion favours the view that the action of a judge who pronounces a civil divorce is not intrinsically wrong. It must be left to the ecclesiastical authority of a country to decide whether, in all the circumstances, it may be tolerated, and, in the absence of any official pronouncement, individual priests should be extremely reticent in passing any sort of judgment on an actual case. In addition to the authors quoted by the writer eight years ago in the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, December, 1924, page 599, here is one of the most recent theological judgments on the matter: "Practice, igitur, seclusis specialibus adjunctis aut positiva prohibitionem Ecclesiae, non videntur reprobandi iudices catholici sententiam divortii ferentes, dummodo opportune scandalo remoto et adhibitis mediis omnibus, quae moraliter adhiberi possunt, ut conjuges a divortio abstineant et reconcilientur, aut saltem simplici separatione corporum contenti sint, tunc tantum pronuntient locum esse divortii, quando vi evidētis tenoris legis strictē interpretatae aliter facere nequeunt."²⁵

E. J. M.

MISSA PRO POPULO.

I find that in the *Ordo* for one English diocese the *Missa pro populo* is appointed for the feast of St. John the Evangelist and not for that of St. Thomas of Canterbury, while that of another diocese has the *Missa pro populo* on the feast of St. Thomas instead of that of St. John. Can you account for this discord? (Canonicus.)

REPLY.

The discrepancy to which our correspondent calls attention appears to be due to the fact that in one diocese the list of suppressed feasts published in the A.A. Sedis 1920, p. 43, on which the *Missa pro populo* is to be said, has been adopted, while in the other the list of those feasts authorized for the English Vicars Apostolic in 1847 is still retained.

The extension of the divine precept mentioned in the decree of

²⁵ Gougnard, *op. cit.*, p. 317.

the Council of Trent (Sess. 23, cap 1 de Reformat.) which binds all to whom the cure of souls is committed to offer sacrifice for them, became limited to those days on which the faithful were under the obligation to hear Mass. (Thus Bened. XV, Constit. *Cum semper*, §6, 7, 1744.) These days had been fixed for the Universal Church in 1642 by Urban VIII and (including the feasts of Easter, Pentecost and the B. Trinity) were thirty-six in number, in addition to the Sundays and the two feasts of the chief national and local patron where either or both of these were kept. To these the Immaculate Conception was added by Clement XI in 1708. Thus a feast day occurred on the average once in every ten working days, and changed social conditions made this fall heavily on the labouring class. Many local ordinaries found it necessary to permit servile work more or less regularly on the feast days, while maintaining the obligation of assisting at Mass. But this relaxation was found to be insufficient for the circumstances and inconsistent in the case of different rules in neighbouring dioceses. Benedict XIV was led to consider the question of framing a new law for the whole Church, but ultimately decided that reduction of the number of feasts should be granted on the petition of Bishops for their diocese, with the proviso that, in order to obtain as much uniformity as possible, an indult would be granted to a diocese only when the neighbouring dioceses had manifested the same desire. In this way the days of obligation were everywhere regulated until the promulgation of the new Code of Canon Law. For England the Vicars Apostolic obtained an Indult in 1777—the year before the first Catholic Relief Act was passed—by which the days of obligation were reduced to twelve, viz., the eight still observed, Easter Monday, Whit Monday, the Annunciation, and the feast of the local patron where this was kept; while in 1830, by a further indult, the two Mondays were suppressed and the feasts of the Annunciation and of the patron were transferred to the following Sunday.

With the cessation of the obligation for the faithful to assist at Mass on these feasts, the question inevitably arose whether the linked duty of the priest to offer the *Missa pro populo* upon them had not lapsed. But the Holy See did not accept that view. That no relaxation of the priest's obligation had occurred was constantly declared by the Sacred Congregations in answer to particular questions, and was frequently mentioned in the Indults by which the suppression of feasts was sanctioned. Ultimately it was published to the whole Church when Pius IX, by the Constitution *Amantissimi Redemptoris* (May 3rd, 1858) renewed in express terms the declaration of several of his predecessors that the obligation of celebrating the *Missa pro populo*, not only on Sundays but also on feast days even suppressed since the Constitution of Urban VIII, remained in full force.

In 1847 the Vicars Apostolic had approached the Holy See on the matter of the days on which the *Missa pro populo* was to be

said in England, and were instructed that the obligation would be satisfied upon those days mentioned at the end of the Roman *Ordo* together with the four days suppressed in 1830 and the feasts of St. Gregory the Great, St. Augustine of Canterbury, St. George, the national patron, and St. Thomas of Canterbury, patron of the English secular clergy. When the constitution *Amantissimi Redemptoris* was promulgated our Bishops sought and obtained leave to continue to follow the grant of 1847. "A general law," they were instructed, "does not in fact invalidate either a special law or a particular ordinance, provided that no mention is made of this in the general law. But the Constitution *Amantissimi* not only makes no mention of this in any way, but expressly declares that if anyone had obtained any Indult this should not be considered annulled by the said Constitution." It was further pointed out that in England only the Bishops were bound to the *Missa pro populo*. The list of days assigned by the grant of 1847 was printed in an appendix to the Provincial Synods (Decreta IV Concil. Provinc. Westmon., p. 87) and shows them to number twenty-three for the country as a whole, with the addition in the county of Durham of the feast of the local patron, St. Cuthbert. This list was generally followed in England until after the promulgation of the Code of Canon Law. The material words of the Constitution *Amantissimi* were: "Et quoniam non desunt animarum curatores, qui peculiare aliquod reductionis, uti dicunt. Indultum ab hac Apostolica Sede obtinuerunt, concedimus, ut ipsi hujusce Indulti beneficio perfrui pergant juxta tamen conditiones in Indulto expressas, et donec parochorum officium exercuerint in parocciis, quas in praesentiarum regunt et administrant." But it is added that where conditions obtain to warrant the reduction of the obligation, Indults are to be sought through the Congregation of the Council, or that of Propaganda Fide.

To the question, which are the suppressed feasts on which Bishops and Priests must offer the *Missa pro populo*, as enjoined in Can. 339, §1, and Can. 466, §1, the Commission for the Authentic Interpretation of the Code gave answer on February 17th, 1918: "Nihil hac in re per Codicem juris canonici immutatum esse a disciplina huc usque vigente" (A.A.S., 1918, p. 170). Thereupon many local Ordinaries petitioned the Congregation of the Council "ut, ad commodiorem quorum interest notitiam, index festorum in universa Ecclesia suppressorum de quibus agitur denuo auctoritative publici juris fieret," and in response the Congregation, on December 28th, 1919, published a list of twenty-six feasts, including those of the chief national and local patron (A.A.S. XII, 42). When to this list are added the ten Holy days of Obligation named in Can. 1247, §1, and the three feasts (Easter, Pentecost and Holy Trinity), it is found coincident with that issued for days of obligation by Urban VIII increased by the Immaculate Conception added by Clement XI.

J. L. WHITFIELD.

ANGELUS AFTER MISSA CANTATA.

May the Angelus be recited at midday, immediately after a Missa Cantata, by the celebrant himself? (R.B.)

REPLY.

"An possint praecipi, aut saltem permitti, aliquae preces recitandae ad Altare post Missam, non depositis sacris vestibus? RESP. Affirmative; dummodo preces dicantur assentiente Ordinario" (S.R.C., *Decreta Authentica*, August 31st, 1867, n. 3157, ad vii.). There are numerous decisions relating to the prayers after Low Mass, other than those ordered by the Holy See, and the authors commonly concede a certain latitude to the priest, with regard to the occasional use of additional prayers, on the supposition that the permission of the Ordinary may be presumed (*Decreta Authentica*, 3537, 3805; *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1909, pp. 656, 927, 336). With regard to a sung Mass the situation is rather different, since the vernacular prayers to which we are accustomed are not said; it would be unlawful, I think, for a priest to presume on the Ordinary's permission even for the occasional use of further prayers after a sung Mass. Nevertheless, the answer quoted above makes no distinction between sung Mass and low Mass, and it is within the power of the Ordinary to sanction the custom of reciting the Angelus.

E. J. M.

VERNACULAR HYMNS DURING MASS.

May Hymns in the vernacular be sung by children during a Low Mass? (R.B.)

REPLY.

The general principle, recalled by Leo XIII and Pius X, and by innumerable decrees of the *Congregation of Rites*, is that Latin is the proper language of the Western Church and that the use of the vernacular is forbidden in liturgical functions. During High Mass the rule admits of no exception, whether it is a question of popular hymns or of vernacular translations of the liturgical chants (Pius X, *Motu Proprio*, November 2nd, 1903, n. 7). But the rule does admit of an exception in the case of Low Mass, provided: (a) that the vernacular chant is not a translation of the liturgical hymns: "Utrum Preces et Hymni liturgici v.g. Introitus, Communio, Hymnus Lauda Sion, a choro musicorum in lingua vernacula cantari possunt infra Missam privatam; an vero eiusmodi cantica tantum prohibita sint coram Sacratissimo exposito? RESP. Negative ad primam partem, juxta Decretum, n. 3537, February 27th, 1882, ad III; ad secundam jam provisum in prima" (S.R.C., March 31st, 1909, *Decreta Authentica*, n. viii. Cf. also n. 4235 ad 8, n. 4268 ad 10); (b) that the singing of vernacular hymns has been duly approved

by the Ordinary: "An in eadem parochiali Ecclesia a fidelibus intra Missam cani possint juxta antiquum morem, a nonnullis annis interruptum, preces vel Hymni lingua vernacula compositi in honorem Sancti vel Mysterii, cuius festum agitur? RESP. Affirmative, de consensu Ordinarii quoad Missam privatam; Negative quoad Missam solemnem sive cantatam" (S.R.C., January 31st, 1896, *Decreta Authentica*, n. 3880); (c) that the hymns are not sung during the elevation (Cf. May 22nd, 1894, n. 3827 ad III; April 26th, 1901, n. 4071 ad I. The first of these texts actually refers to a sung Mass, the second to a Conventual Mass, but there can be no doubt that the rule applies to Low Mass as well.) While admitting the lawfulness of the practice which, in the case of very small children, is probably the best way of securing their attention, it may be pointed out that the Church extends little more than a bare toleration to the use of vernacular hymns in liturgical functions, owing to the heretical origin of the practice. It is greatly to be desired, and most urgently recommended by the more recent Sovereign Pontiffs, that children should be taught liturgical chants.

E. J. M.

PUBLIC RECITATION OF THE ROSARY.

Should the Glorious Mysteries alone be recited publicly on all Sundays throughout the year? (R.B.)

REPLY.

The widely spread custom of reciting the Joyful Mysteries on Mondays and Thursdays, the Sorrowful Mysteries on Tuesdays and Fridays, and the Glorious Mysteries on Wednesdays, Saturdays and Sundays, has been approved by the Holy See and should be retained. "Retenta consuetudine huic Sanctae Sedi probata, ut per gyrum cuiuslibet hebdomadae singula mysteria ita recolantur: . . . gloriosa tandem in dominica, quarta feria et sabbato" (Leo XIII, *Ubi Primum*, n. xiii, 1898; Ferraris, *Bibliotheca, Supplementum*, p. 699). It should be noted, however, that the decree is concerned with the rights and privileges of the Confraternity of the Rosary, and it is supposed that, as far as possible, the Rosary is being recited every day. The text quoted repeats the phrase of the *Congregation of Indulgences*, July 1st, 1839, ad 5, which approved this custom, but it is not necessary to recite the appropriate mysteries in order to gain the Indulgences which may be attached (*Tractatus de Indulgentiis Mechliniensis*, 1926, p. 188; *Ami du Clergé*, 1909, page 539). I can find no author dealing with the point, but it is my opinion that, although this custom should generally be observed in the public recitation of the Rosary, it is entirely lawful to depart from it occasionally; e.g., on Passion Sunday the recitation of the Sorrowful Mysteries is more suitable.

E. J. M.

USE OF THE STOLE WHEN PREACHING.

Is the custom of wearing a stole while preaching to be followed by all secular priests, or is it optional? (R.B.)

REPLY.

The various answers of the Congregation of Rites on the use of a stole order it to be worn universally on certain occasions, e.g., during the funeral office, and forbid its use universally on other occasions, e.g., during a funeral oration. Midway between these two categories its use is ordered, not universally, but only in places where the custom exists; the use of a stole during preaching is, as far as my knowledge goes, customary in England and, therefore, should be continued, in spite of the custom of certain priests who may dislike the practice. "Viget in aliquibus locis usus deferendi stolam in Verbi Domini annuntiatione, etiam extra Missarum solemniam. Quaeritur inde: An sit dictus usus legitimus, et an obliget regulares in suis saltem ecclesiis? Et quatenus affirmative: Cuius coloris debeat esse praedicta stola: an semper coloris albi; vel potius diei currentis? RESP. Affirmative in omnibus, ad primam partem; ad secundam vero, color respondeat officio diei" (S.C.R., August 31st, 1867. *Decreta Authentica*, n. 3157 ad vi.). "Stolam a Sacerdote adhibendam esse quum conficit aut administrat sacramenta, aut officium aliquod facit quo Stola adhibenda sit; aut etiam cum concionatur, si in eo loco adest consuetudo" (*Decreta Authentica*, n. 3185; Cf. also *Decreta Authentica*, n. 3117: *Collationes Brugenses*, 1931, page 251). It is hardly correct to say that "there is no authority for the stole, except recognized custom" (Fortescue, *The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite*, 1920, p. 238); it is clear that the Holy See has declared that the custom is to be retained.

E. J. M.

SERMON DURING EXPOSITION.

May the Monstrance remain uncovered during a sermon on the Blessed Sacrament? (R.B.)

REPLY.

The subject is dealt with in the *Instructio Clementina*, §XXXII. and in pages 120-122 of the quasi-official commentary of Gardellini in Vol. IV of the *Decreta Authentica*, S.R.C. The distinction made by this commentator is not between sermons on the Blessed Sacrament and sermons on other doctrines, but between the lawfulness of sitting down or not sitting down on the part of the Congregation. "Vel enim conciones habentur coram Sacramento publice exposito et detecto . . . vel agitur de Sacramento utique publicae venerationi exposito, sed aliquo modo aperto. . . . Hinc autem nulla notanda censura est consuetudo habendi conciones, quae magis congruunt circumstantiis, Sacramento velamine tecto ac sedente

populo; sed nullatenus sedere populo permittendum esset, si conciones haberentur coram Sacramento nullo velamine tecto." Gasparri, *De Eucharistia*, Vol. II, §1045, points out that this ruling applies to exposition "extra Urbem pro aliis quoque expositionibus," not merely to the XL Hours Exposition in Rome. A reply in *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1921, page 592, decides without any hesitation that the rule requiring the Blessed Sacrament to be veiled suffers no exception, when the sermon is for the purpose of furthering the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. Therefore, although it is not customary in this country, no general law appears to be violated by preaching on any Christian doctrine before the Blessed Sacrament unveiled, provided the people do not sit down. I say no general law is violated; there are doubtless, in many places, episcopal directions requiring the Blessed Sacrament to be veiled during all sermons, whether the people are seated or not. The reply of S.R.C., May 10th, 1890, makes no use of the distinction: "Apposito tamen velamine ante SS. Eucharistiam, dum habetur concio" (*Decreta Authentica*, n. 3728).

E. J. M.

THE ASPERGES.

Is the blessing of water for the Asperges to be performed every Sunday in parish churches? (R.B.)

REPLY.

(1) The common law orders the *Asperges* in Collegiate churches; in others, such as parish churches, it is praiseworthy but not obligatory (S.R.C., December 15th, 1899, *Decreta Authentica*, n. 4051). In England, however, the bishops require the *Asperges* in parish churches, a direction which is contained in the *Ordo Administrandi Sacramenta*, Tit. XI, cap. 1, n. 4, and is usually explicitly repeated in the diocesan *Ordo*, e.g., *Westminster Ordo*, 1933, p. xxxiii.

(2) The liturgical rule is that the water for the *Asperges* must be blessed each Sunday before Mass, except at Easter and Pentecost, when the baptismal water blessed the previous day is to be used in churches which have a font. This rule is quite clear from the rubrics of the *Rituale Romanum*, Tit. VIII, cap. 2, repeated in our English *Ordo*: "Diebus Dominicis, et quandocunque opus fuerit . . ."; and from the *Ordo ad faciendam aquam benedictam* in the Missal. It is noted by most of the authors, e.g., De Herdt, *Sacrae Liturgiae Praxis*, III, n. 129; Dunne, *English Ritual Explained*, page 160; *Collationes Brugenses*, 1899, page 144. The blessing of the water and the subsequent *Asperges* should not be separated, for the whole rite is meant to recall the Sacrament of Baptism. Even in places where the *Asperges* is not obligatory, fresh water should be blessed every week, though not necessarily before the Mass on Sunday (*Ceremoniale Episcoporum*, Lib I, cap. 6, §2).

It is consistent with a due observance of this rule occasionally to use water blessed on the previous Sunday, should there be some proportionate reason for so doing (*L'Ami du Clergé*, 1920, p. 671). It is always lawful to use salt which has been exorcized on a previous occasion and reserved for the purpose (S.R.C., April 8th, 1713, *Decreta Authentica*, n. 2218 ad 3).

E. J. M.

REQUIEM MASS.

Is it lawful to have more than two candles on the altar during a Requiem *praesente cadavere*, *sine cantu*? (R.B.)

REPLY.

In principle this Mass should always be sung (*Rit. Rom.*, tit. vi., cap. 3, n. 6). In England and other places permission has been obtained for a Low Mass on this occasion "ob Sacerdotum inopiam" (March 7th, 1847; *Decreta IV. Conc. Prov. West.*, page 85). In addition a Low Mass is now lawful everywhere "pro pauperibus" (Additiones, etc., III, n. 4 in the rubrics of the new Roman Missal). We will suppose, therefore, that the celebration in question is a Low Mass for a lawful reason. The rule limiting the number of candles to two for Low Masses admits of an exception in the case of those which are not strictly *Missae Privatae*, e.g., "quoad Missas quae celebrantur loco solemnitis atque cantatae" (*Decreta Authentica*, 3059, ad VII.); an example of such an exception is certainly the Low Mass celebrated according to the *Memoriale* in small churches during Holy Week. In my opinion, a Low Mass of Requiem *praesente cadavere* is also an example. In Masses loco *Missae solemnitis* the correct number of candles, according to Many, is four (*Praelectiones De Missa*, n. 127).

E. J. M.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

THE JUBILEE.

The formal documents introducing an Extraordinary Year of Jubilee have now been published. They include the "Indictio Anni Sancti extra ordinem ac Generalis Maximique Jubilaei," dated January 6th, and three Apostolic Constitutions, dated January 30th (A.A.S., XXV, pp. 6-22).

THE BULL OF INDICATION.

The Bull *Quod nuper* repeats—ad omnium utilitatem—the catalogue of events which the Jubilee commemorates in the cycle of Redemption. It reaffirms the fact that even our civil culture—true civil culture—has its basis in those events. For from that source "novus universae hominum consortioni saeculorum nascitur ordo."

Throughout the Year of Atonement, earnest prayer and penance should be offered for our own eternal welfare and for a troubled world, to implore peace for men's souls, due freedom for the Church, harmony and prosperity for all peoples. In its opening and closing, the Jubilee is linked with Easter. In each diocese, the faithful should be encouraged to purify and strengthen themselves by sacramental confession and frequent Communion, and to sanctify Good Friday particularly by fervent meditation on the Passion.

It is desirable that as many pilgrims as can will flock to Rome, since this visit is a condition for gaining the plenary pardon of the Jubilee. Rome is the centre of our faith and the see of Christ's Vicar. In Rome alone may the illustrious Relics of the Passion and the table of the Last Supper be venerated. Rome is the home of our common Father who invites us, prays for us, blesses us.

Fittingly, too, will pilgrimages to Palestine be arranged during this year, to visit and venerate the theatre of the events we commemorate. During the year, notable Relics of the Passion, wherever preserved, should receive special veneration.

The extraordinary Jubilee in the Eternal City will last from April 2nd, 1933 to April 2nd, 1934. All Catholics who, duly absolved in the sacrament of confession, and nourished in their souls by Holy Communion, make three devout visits to the Basilicas of St. John Lateran, St. Peter, St. Paul and St. Mary Major, and there pray for the Pope's intention, may gain the

fullest remission of all temporal punishment due for their sins. The visits may be made in any order whatsoever, on the same or on different days. To allow the conditions to be runned in a short time, a second and a third visit to the same Basilica may be made at once, after coming out from the first. The Jubilee indulgence may be gained for oneself or for the souls in Purgatory, as often as the prescribed works are carried out. The Papal intentions include both the general intentions of this Pontificate and the special intentions mentioned above.

In addition to such prayers as devotion may suggest, the following are commanded at each visit: (1) the "Our Father," "Hail Mary" and "Glory be to the Father" five times before the Blessed Sacrament altar, and once also for the Pope's intention; (2) the "I believe" three times before a Crucifix, together with some such prayer as "We adore Thee, O Christ, and we praise Thee" once; (3) the "Hail Mary" seven times before a statue or picture of Our Blessed Lady—in remembrance of her Sorrows—with a short prayer such as "Holy Mother, pierce me through, etc.," said once; (4) the "I believe" before the *Confessio* of the Basilica.

All who, through death or sickness or other legitimate cause, fail to complete the prescribed visits, may gain the full indulgence by their Jubilee confession and Holy Communion.

Romans and pilgrims are exhorted also to pay devout visits to the Relics' Chapel in the Basilica of Santa Croce, and to the Scala Santa.

THE SUPPLEMENTARY CONSTITUTIONS.

(1) *Suspension of Indulgences and Faculties.*

In the year 1472, Sixtus IV decreed that all indulgences should be suspended during the period of the Jubilee, and also all faculties granted to anyone outside Rome to dispense or absolve in either forum, in the name and by the authority of the Holy See. The Constitution *Nulla non tempore* renews this rule, and adds that it must be understood as applying to the Oriental, as to the Western, Church.

Certain exceptions are, however, admitted:

- (a) the indulgences to be gained *in articulo mortis*;
- (b) the indulgence for reciting the *Angelus* or *Regina coeli*, or, if neither can be said, five "Hail Marys";
- (c) the indulgences granted to those who visit the Blessed Sacrament exposed during the Quarant'Ore devotion;
- (d) the indulgences to be gained by those who accompany the Blessed Sacrament carried to the sick, or send a candle for use in such processions;
- (e) the *toties quoties* indulgence granted to those who devoutly visit the Portiuncula Chapel near Assisi;
- (f) the indulgences for visiting the Holy Places in Palestine;
- (g) the plenary indulgence, to be gained only once, by such

as piously visit the grotto at Lourdes on any day from February 11th, 1933 to February 11th, 1934 (this indulgence was recently granted to commemorate the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Apparitions);

(h) the indulgence which major prelates may grant in pontifical and other functions.

All other indulgences may be gained in favour of the dead, but not of the living. Excommunication is incurred *ipso facto* by anyone publishing indulgences not specifically excepted.

Faculties and indults to absolve from cases reserved to the Pope or the Holy See, to remove censures, to dispense from vows or commute them, and to dispense from irregularities or impediments, are withdrawn for the period of the Jubilee. Again there are exceptions:

(a) the faculties recently granted in Palestine and in Lourdes;

(b) all faculties granted by the Code;

(c) the faculties possessed for the external forum by Nuncios, Apostolic Delegates, local and religious Ordinaries;

(d) the faculties for the internal forum usually granted by the S. Penitentiary to Ordinaries and confessors; these powers, however, may only be exercised in cases where the Ordinary (or confessor) is convinced that the penitent cannot without great inconvenience repair to Rome.

(2) *Extraordinary Faculties of Confessors in Rome.*

The Constitution *Indictio a Nobis* provides for the appointment of other *poenitentarii minores* in addition to the ordinary and extraordinary officers attached to three great Basilicas. They are given power to absolve—*pro foro conscientiae in actu sacramentalis confessionis et per se ipsi tantum*—any penitent whatsoever from any censure or sin reserved to the Roman Pontiff, or reserved by law to the Ordinary, and even to absolve *a censura ab homine lata*. Such absolution, however, has no effect in the external forum.

The precise implications of this concession, with its limits, are further defined under fifteen heads. Six paragraphs are devoted to the extraordinary powers assigned to all confessors approved by the Cardinal Vicar, or by their Religious Superiors, for specified times, places and persons.

(3) *Cloistered Religious and Exceptional Cases.*

Of more immediate importance to the ordinary confessor outside Rome, is the third Constitution *Qui umbratilem*, which lays down the conditions on which the Jubilee may be gained by persons dispensed from visiting Rome. Such are, in the first place, all Nuns of enclosed Orders and their extern Sisters; all other Sisters bound by simple vows and communities of women Oblates and Tertiaries, together with their novices and postulants,

and pupils living together in convent or school; also, all enclosed Orders of men, prisoners, invalids incapable of fulfilling the Jubilee prescriptions, persons continuously occupied in hospital or prison duties, workmen so bound to daily toil as to be unable to spare the time required, and persons over seventy years of age.

For all these classes, the minimum demanded includes confession and an earnest determination to strive after perfection, a devout reception of Holy Communion to strengthen this resolve, and prayer for the Pope's intentions—the growth of the Catholic Church, the uprooting of errors, the concord of rulers and the peace of society. Works of devotion or charity should be substituted for the visits. They will be prescribed by the Ordinary in any way he shall determine, in person or through prudent confessors. Allowance should be made in each case for differences in health or circumstances, times and places.

The penitent may choose any confessor canonically approved by the Ordinary. The confessor will have power to absolve (in the sacramental forum only) from all censures and sins reserved even *speciali modo* to the Apostolic See, or reserved to the Ordinary, except in the case of formal external heresy. A salutary penance must be imposed, and all else enjoined which the law requires. In the case of nuns, the confessor will have power to dispense from all private vows made after solemn profession. He may also commute all private vows of Sisters or other women or girls living in community. Where, however, a vow is reserved to the Holy See, or a dispensation would injure the rights of others, or a commutation be less likely than the original vow to safeguard virtue, no dispensation or commutation may be granted.

BOOK REVIEWS

Pugin. By Michael Trappes-Lomax. (Sheed & Ward. pp. 358. 15s. net.)

Preaching at the funeral of Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin, at St. Augustine's, Ramsgate, on September 21st, 1852, Mgr. Grant, Bishop of Southwark, said: "A future age will look upon these monuments, and will ask how one man could have achieved so much, and posterity will envy to us the possession of a man who could accomplish undertakings in a few years that would have been wonderful if they had extended over many. . . ." His Lordship was both right and wrong. If we contemplate the architect's vast achievement we do indeed wonder, and realize the truth of the saying that he did a century's work in a lifetime of forty years. But Mgr. Grant could not anticipate that eighty years later the question: "Who was this Pugin?" would excite no surprise.

He was an architect, and a convert to Catholicism at the age of twenty-two; he designed numerous churches and other buildings (including Birmingham, Nottingham, Newcastle, Southwark and Killarney Cathedrals, Mount St. Bernard's Abbey, St. Edmund's College Chapel, St. Giles's, Cheadle, St. Mary's, Derby, St. Oswald's, Liverpool, and Scarisbrick Hall), and was responsible for the whole of the Houses of Parliament, from the river *façade* to the bell-pulls, except the plan and the plumbing (but Sir Charles Barry got the credit): he made drawings for stage-scenery, furniture at Windsor Castle, vestments, tiles, stained-glass, iron-work, and ink-pots; he was professor of ecclesiastical antiquities at Oscott; he wrote and illustrated half a dozen considerable works on gothic art, as well as numerous pamphlets. But he was more than all this implies. He was the first modern man to begin really to understand what gothic architecture is, and was the spear-point of the "revival"; he was the first Catholic to protest, loudly and insistently, against what a great Catholic artist of our own day has well called "repository art," condemning it as bad work in itself, as a cause of *admiratio* and repulsion to non-Catholics, and as a disguise upon the Bride of Christ which no pragmatic appeal to expediency can justify;¹ he was, after the Oxford Movement began, one of the two laymen who had "the responsibility of advising Wiseman on the handling of the unprecedented

¹ Hear him on what he called "heart painting": "It is quite possible to embody the pure idea of the divine heart under a mystical form that should illustrate the intention without offending the sense; but when this *most spiritual idea* is depicted by an anatomical painting of a heart copied from an original plucked from the reeking carcase of a bullock, and done with sickening accuracy of fat and veins, relieved on a chrome yellow ground, it becomes a fitting subject of fierce denunciation for every true Christian artist, as a disgusting and unworthy representation for any object of devotion" (*italics his*). If "ordinary people" (*i.e.*, not "artists") are not affected in the same way then there must be a defect in their religious upbringing.

situation." In spite of the reasons that can be brought forward to account for it, it is surprising that Pugin should have become, so soon and so completely, only a name, even among Catholics. We are, therefore, the more grateful to the writer and the publishers of this masterly biography. Messrs. Sheed & Ward say justly in their "blurb" that "The author and his subject will be a great discovery for a multitude of readers." Mr. Michael Trappes-Lomax writes with knowledge, sympathy, and scrupulous fairness, and has exactly gauged the degree of gentle irony that his subject requires.

Few people to-day, however much they may dislike "gothic," would now deny that Pugin was on the right side in the violent controversies of which he was the occasion. And that is in spite of the fact that we, who have lived to see St. Philip's, Arundel, St. John's, Norwich, Downside, and Buckfast on the one hand, and Westminster Cathedral and a number of smaller churches on the other, know that the "gothic revival" has shot its bolt—though, no doubt, imitation mediæval churches will be built here and there for a long time yet (on page 327 Mr. Trappes-Lomax has an excellent paragraph on the fundamental unsoundness of the revival: "Pugin's error lay in not realizing that the social order was new . . . there was no underlying mediæval life. There was nothing, as it were, in which his work could strike deep roots"). But for one who was essentially right-minded it is marvellous how wrong, even wrong-headed, Pugin at times could be. Take the matter of rood-screens. He was right in fighting for the inviolability of the holy place wherein the altar stands, but he was wrong in claiming that it could only be maintained, and always had been maintained, by a form of rood-screen. He was sublimely sure that the mediæval screen was directly descended in tail male from the ancient *cancelli*; he had no idea that the Eastern *eikonostasis* did not attain its present form before the seventeenth century (incidentally, similar misunderstandings rather knock the bottom out of the quotation from Mr. Evelyn Waugh, *à propos* of Debra Libanos, on page 245). Or again, Pugin's frequent use of the epithet "pagan," always as a term of abuse, for anything that was not gothic. Apparently he did know the origin of the basilican church, but he would not face up to it and make the necessary inferences. When in Rome, San Clemente, S. Maria in Cosmedin, SS. Cosma e Damiano, San Lorenzo, and the rest are dismissed in six words: "the old Basilicas are very interesting"; and he returns to his gloriously vigorous comments on the works of the Renaissance. It is not for us to criticize him too severely. The uncontrolled use of the word "pagan," and its equivalents, is still allowed to confuse issues for simple people; not only in the popular press but when, as in 1929, a very well-known Catholic preacher referred in print to the London Cenotaph as "breathing an evil spirit. I believe that the backs of these architects' minds are, more or less consciously, anti-Christian," a few days before the name of the architect of Liverpool Cathedral was announced.

In a controversy between "gothic" and "renaissance," "pagan" has got nothing to do with it, just as in a controversy between any admittedly "ecclesiastical style" and, say, the new church at Raincy or Cork, "pagan" has nothing to do with it. Were Pugin alive to-day he would meet Catholics every bit as much opposed to neo-classical churches as himself, but equally opposed to neo-gothic—and for *fundamentally the same reason*. Namely, that a good and reasonable system of building and ornament is the natural product of the workmen² and their environment (industrial, social, religious) at a given time and place, and cannot be produced artificially by the revival or copying of an art perfected in another time, place, and environment. Pugin called himself a "mediæval man," which is precisely what he was not: he was a nineteenth-century man; but he did not see that to behave as such did not necessarily involve building like Sir William Tite or "Enwood, Esqr." His insistence on the exclusive Christianity of gothic architecture was equally arbitrary. No doubt, considered *historically*, it is the "Christian building"; but any way of building ever used by Christian men is Christian building—not, of course, all of them equally good and none of them valid *semper et ubique et ab omnibus*. A writer in *Fraser's Magazine* in 1837 pointed out that "when [Pugin] attempts to fix upon the Reformation the stigma of having occasioned the decline and disuse of the gothic style, he is palpably absurd." So he was. But he went further, and maintained, at any rate at first, "that everything grand, edifying, and noble in art is the result of feelings produced by the Catholic religion on the human mind." That also is palpably absurd. But it is an absurdity that many Catholics still vaguely believe—to the detriment of the quality of their religion and the, often impatient, amusement of their better-informed non-Catholic neighbours.

There are two stories about Pugin that are usually told as jokes. The one is that once while he was explaining to a friend in St. Barnabas's, Nottingham, that none but clerics and their assistants might enter the sanctuary, there appeared within the screen two women—accompanied by Dr. Wiseman. The other is that, observing a priest to be wearing an old French vestment, he exclaimed: "What is the use, my dear sir, of praying for the conversion of England in a cope like that?" These incidents have their humorous side, but they're not jokes. To Pugin what he saw as the cheapening of the material sanctuary was a tragedy—"he retired to the nearest bench and burst into tears." And, rightly understood, the cope remark was sound sense—it sometimes seems to be forgotten that the cultured, the highbrow, the sensitive, the aesthete, yea, even the ritualist, also have souls to be saved. The well-known words of Huysmans in *En Route* about "l'ignorance du clergé" and "le patriciat des âmes" are bitter and exaggerated—but Mr. Trappes-Lomax

² Even including architects, as distinct from builders, for architects are not really able to dispense with the building methods of their own day and be "at will Egyptian or Chinese," as the late Professor Lethaby put it.

quotes them. Pugin himself was cultured and sensitive, but he was none of the other things I have named, at any rate in a pejorative sense; he never talked "artistic temperament" stuff and he was humble, though he often did not sound it. He was a good Christian man and, according to his light, workman. He worked twelve or more hours a day, he sailed a boat whenever he got the chance, he dressed according to his requirements and state, he assisted at Mass and Compline daily, he was most generous with his goods, and he married three times in seventeen years.

That Pugin's principles of art were sound at bottom may be illustrated by his sensible remarks about railway-stations (page 177), by his recognition that the over-praised chapel of Henry VII at Westminster represents the gothic flower gone to seed, and by the fact that he saw that churches should be built in the same way ("style") as any other buildings. The notion of an exclusively ecclesiastical "style" is not an inheritance from the Renaissance any more than from the Middle Ages: there were baroque mansions and town-halls as well as churches, and the charming eighteenth-century houses and bridges and shops in English country-towns have their counterpart in such churches as that of Billesley in Warwickshire. This error, which still darkens the counsel of building-committees and, particularly I fear, of the clergy, is specifically Victorian; and, in spite of his own freedom from it, it seems to be due to Pugin more than to anyone else. He taught that churches and other buildings should be built in the same way; but he also taught that this way was necessarily the mediæval way, because, according to him, that was the only *Christian* architecture. Now to the Victorian public, Christian man was almost exclusively man in relation to Sunday and a place of worship: it did not see him, as Christian, in relation to a home, a pub, a workshop, a council-hall. Therefore, this business of "Christian architecture," which Pugin put across with such terrific energy, became popularly associated with ecclesiastical buildings alone, and the radical distinction between sacred and profane, namely, the end for which the building is used, was lost sight of.

It must be emphasized again and again that Pugin's own fundamental principles were sound; only he did not see that a revival of gothic was not their necessary conclusion, was not demanded but rather excluded by them. "In matters of ordinary use, a man must go out of his way to make a bad thing," he said stoutly, and summed up what he was after thus: "we do not wish to produce mere servile imitators of former excellence of any kind, but men imbued with the consistent spirit of the ancient architects, who would work on their principles, and carry them out as the old men would have done, had they been placed in similar circumstances, and with similar wants to ourselves." Upon which Mr. Trappes-Lomax observes "What a hope!" I can think of no better comment.

DONALD ATTWATER.

Rafael Cardinal Merry del Val, by F. A. Forbes. (Longmans. 6s.)

This character sketch of Cardinal Merry del Val is certainly well done. Its most valuable feature lies in the quotations from his letters which reveal more of the man than pages of psychological dissection could do.

In a sense his was a thwarted life; that is, from the day when Leo XIII insisted on sending him to the Academia and gave him high place almost before he was tested in the elements of a priestly character. He did not want to be a diplomatist, not even an ecclesiastical diplomatist. He thirsted for souls and longed only to do the work of hum-drum Mission life in England. One can understand how the routine of ante-camera at the Vatican must have galled him. But one was not prepared for the loathing in which he held his work when the highest rank was his and he stood shoulder to shoulder with Pius X in the government of the Church. It was only his love for God for Whom the work was done, and his devotion to the Pope with whom it was done, that carried him through. His natural dignity, his inability to be anything but a striking figure, his Spanish respect for the punctilios all combined to make a legend of his magnificence and make men believe he liked it. One needed to see him on holiday, or with the young and unimportant, to doubt the accuracy of this conviction.

But even without the privilege of this intimacy, anyone with eyes could see a deeply spiritual character. If his was the most princely figure at any function, it was also the most recollected. High Mass on Easter Sunday in St. Peter's is by way of being a social crush. Globe-trotters of any or no denomination foregather in the basilica before turning north for the season. And in the midst of the hub-bub and hand-shaking which went on all around the altar at which he was officiating, the Cardinal remained absorbed in the sacred business he was about. No startling fortissimo of the Choir, no clash between impossibly ill-behaved tourists and usually tolerant sacristans, though eye and ear were both assailed, could distract his attention for one moment from the Host on the corporal. Unfortunately, it was a lesson lost on those who had come to church to discuss the weather in Egypt or prices in Sicily. But it was not lost on everyone. And he was the same in Choir at Little Hours or Vespers, when the crowd jostled for position and stared through the grille of the Chapel for all the world as if they were at the Zoo. Canons might raise their eyes from the books; the Cardinal never. If curiosity turned the liturgy into a peep-show, so much the worse for the curious. To him it was ever the *opus divinum* which should not be and could not be cheapened by the accident of such public celebration.

His longing for apostolic work, for the searching after lost sheep or the defence of those already in the fold, had to be satisfied by the minutes he could steal with his boys' club in Trastevere or with the letters he wrote to those who sought his

counsel. These are wonderful, indeed, and the extracts in this book will be such a revelation to many as was Snead-Cox's *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*. Not only do they sketch the self-portrait of a man of God, humble, patient and utterly devoted, but they spring the surprises of moods of depression, bursts of high spirits, moments of playfulness, home-sickness, day-dreams—things that the very majesty of the man hid from all but his nearest friends.

So, when we finish these pages, we may have little idea of Merry del Val's place in history. But whatever his particular niche, the figure within can never again be only a stone statue to us.

RICHARD L. SMITH.

The Necessity for Catholic Reunion. By Rev. T. Whitton, M.A. (Williams & Norgate. 163 pages. 5s.)

If we are not aware of the existence of certain Anglicans who are, apparently, persuaded that the Catholic Church, Pope and all, is the appointed guide for salvation, it is not because they keep it secret. What surprises us, or would do if we worried about it, is that these excellent people prefer to run the risk of remaining outside the true Church, in spite of what seem to be their convictions. The present book attempts rather too much. It is little more than a series of notes or jottings on Modernism, Malta, Anglican Orders, Bishop Barnes, Nullity Decrees, and in fact everything which has a bearing, however remotely, on the possibility of Anglican reunion with the Catholic Church. On almost every page the reader wants to know more explicitly what the author means, and frequently it is not clear whether he is describing his own position or the views of some particular school of thought within the Anglican Church. One even longs, at times, for a solid plain thesis in thick type, after the traditional manner of the theological schools.

In spite of this, the book is informative and valuable. It is informative because it records many things that a Catholic would not care to say, for fear of giving offence. We are told, what many of us have always suspected, that the ordinary Anglican Catholic estimates the "catholicity" of a priest, not from his dogmatic and moral teaching, but from the standard of his ceremonial. We are told, also, that many Anglican parents would prefer Roman Catholic husbands for their daughters, for the fact that a young man goes to the sacraments in a ritualistic church is no longer a safeguard with respect to contraceptive practices. It is valuable because the author clearly understands that if "Rome" were to admit that even the most Romanizing Anglicans were Catholics, she would admit the division of the Church. On the necessity of one visible Church, which is apparently the "Roman Catholic" Church, the writer's mind appears to be clear; it is the one simple and consistent theme running through the whole book, and from it is drawn the necessary deduction that the separation of Anglicans from the Holy See is not due to the Papal claims. To what then is it due? A chapter is devoted to various

"obstacles" on the part of Rome, but, once granted that the "Roman Catholic" Church is the Church, this collection of obstacles is trivial. Of the four answers to the call for reunion with the Holy See, the last one is "that union with the Holy See is necessary for salvation; that corporate reunion being impossible, nothing remains but submission on the best terms obtainable." And to this answer, with its suggestion of compromise, must be added the further reflection: "if an Anglican is convinced that the Roman Church is the true Church, he is bound to join her at once, on her terms, without waiting for concessions." The author himself appears to trend in the direction of this answer, but he displays so many wares that it is difficult to say which one he favours most. If the supposition is true, he is one more example of the surprising position mentioned at the beginning of this review. Of two things, one: either the Romanizing Anglicans are disloyal to the Church of England or their religion is entirely one of personal private judgment. Yet, we are told that the first is a stupid accusation and the second ridiculous.

In these days of attack upon all forms of Christianity and all forms of religion, a Catholic is extremely loth to make points against anyone who professes the name of Christ, least of all against those Anglicans who are so enthusiastically devoted to their cause. "The will of our hearts and our prayer to God is for them unto salvation; for they have a zeal for God." With books of this type in circulation our controversialists may refrain from hard-hitting. If it proves anything, it proves that Anglo-Catholics as a body are heterogeneous, incoherent, undecided, undisciplined, and that reunion can be effected only by individuals joining the Church. The official authorities of the Church in this country, and the Catholic clergy as well, are sometimes reproached by uninformed foreigners for their alleged lack of sympathy with Anglo-Catholic aspirations. The truth is that we view Anglo-Catholics with exactly the same sympathy as is extended to every non-Catholic in good faith, whether he belongs to the "English Church Union" or the "Salvation Army."

E. J. M.

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

FRANCE.

BY DENIS GWYNN.

M. Paul-Boncour's Ministry has fulfilled expectations by being extremely short-lived; and yet another stop-gap Ministry has since been formed. M. Daladier is a much more formidable leader than the ideologue whom he has replaced. But the condition of French politics at present scarcely affords any hope of forming a stable government on the usual lines. M. Daladier, like M. Paul-Boncour, tried hard to persuade the Socialists to help him in forming a Government of the Left. But they have

refused in the belief that continued paralysis of government must hasten the break-up of Capitalism. So, M. Daladier has had to form yet another Ministry of various parties, which could only be held together by the premiership of a vigorous and experienced leader like M. Herriot. Conditions cannot continue for much longer in this unsatisfactory state, and the parties of the Left are beginning to realize that the choice will very soon lie between saving what they can of the traditional programme of the Left, by agreeing on some solid basis, or else having to face the exasperation of a country which will demand a National Government, containing inevitably a large representation of the Right.

Meanwhile there is less immediate danger of anti-clerical policies than there has been for some time past. The Budget deficit continues to grow prodigiously. The drastic cuts in military expenditure which have been voted this month and the other economies which have been made do not cover half the deficit, even with the assistance of new taxes. The chief anxiety for the Church has been the persistent efforts to enforce a State monopoly of education. But such ambitions on the part of the Left have cost the State enormous expenditure since the War. Subsidies for school buildings alone have cost 870 million francs in the past five years alone, as against less than 200 millions between 1919 and 1927. The Vote for education has increased correspondingly in the same periods; and it must inevitably become the subject of fierce attack when other economies are being proposed. The Catholics can argue confidently that their own Catholic schools cost the State nothing, that they only ask to be allowed to keep their pupils, and that the politicians have themselves to blame for incurring these huge expenses by trying to force Catholic children into State schools.

A most interesting position has arisen since I wrote last month concerning the conflicting views of Catholics of the Right and of the Left. An open quarrel, which might have split the Catholic forces most seriously, has been averted by the intervention of the Executive of Catholic Action in Paris. Disagreement had become increasingly acute between the Association Catholique de la Jeunesse Française (which is roughly similar to our C.Y.M.S. and K.S.C.) and the National Catholic Federation, of which General de Castelnau is the President. That valiant veteran was one of the most effective organizers of the Catholic resistance to Herriot's anti-clerical campaign of 1924, and the Federation owed much to the prestige and the splendid energy of its venerable President. But of late it has shown strong disapproval of what it regards as the pacifist and defeatist tendencies of the A.C.J.F., which is on the whole an organization for younger men. Conflict of opinion arose over the attempts by certain younger leaders to apply in practice the teaching of the Holy Father on international relations. Their endeavours to promote friendship with Germany, and to encourage disarmament, soon scandalized the old-fashioned Catholic conservatives; and recriminations were

becoming frequent on both sides. The National Federation said that the Pope's teaching was being shamefully distorted to cloak treasonable and defeatist propaganda; while the A.C.J.F. party protested that the older Nationalists refused to listen to the Pope's appeals for reconciliation. An open quarrel on those lines had almost begun, and several leading bishops had been obliged to defend the A.C.J.F. against the accusations of treason, when a recently formed body in Paris boldly intervened to insist that no public dispute should be allowed.

The Central Executive of Catholic Action in Paris is a body which was constituted last year as the outcome of special discussions by the French Cardinals and Archbishops. They decided to create a central organization to co-ordinate and develop Catholic Action in all its forms. Its executive consists of only four persons—its ecclesiastical president, who is the Vicar-General of Paris; its ecclesiastical assessor, who is the director of young people's works in Versailles; its lay assessor, the lawyer, M. Henry Reverdy; and its procurator general, who is Canon Flaus, head of the Basilica of Montmartre. Attached to this Executive and forming part of the official G.H.Q. of Catholic Action, are various committees formed to deal with the principal phases of Catholic Action. Its work is still in its earliest stage, and even its existence was scarcely known when it intervened in the name of the Hierarchy to order a complete cessation of controversy in every Catholic newspaper on this special dispute.

The swift success of that intervention suggests what immense influence the Catholic Action Council may attain in regard to all questions upon which the Pope issues practical instructions. Also it should provide very necessary assistance in interpreting what the Holy Father actually desires. Differences of opinion concerning His Holiness's teaching on international questions were only to be expected. And pending the issue of an official interpretation, it is specially interesting to note the remarkable statement on the subject by Cardinal Liénart, Bishop of Lille. His Eminence was made a Cardinal very soon after becoming a bishop, as an emphatic sign of the Holy Father's close interest in his work for the Catholic trade union movement. On all the more or less political subjects which the Pope has touched in his encyclicals Cardinal Liénart may probably be regarded as the chief exponent of what the Pope desires. On the present question, particularly, he is not likely to have made a public statement without being quite sure of his ground.

In his diocesan organ at Lille, Cardinal Liénart points out that a generation ago Catholics were similarly divided on the interpretation of the Papal teaching on social questions. The Catholic trade unionists who looked to Leo XIII for inspiration and for protection were regarded with intense suspicion. (In Paris a few weeks ago, Cardinal Verdier spoke in a similar strain in conferring the K.C.S.G. upon M. Zirnheld, the president of the French Catholic trade union movement. He even said openly that many bishops had at first opposed the

movement but that the attitude of the Catholic trade union pioneers had encouraged Leo XIII to publish his various encyclicals.) So now in regard to reconciliation between enemy countries, and also regarding disarmament, Cardinal Liénart protested strongly against any accusation of "treason" being levelled against those who try to apply what the Pope teaches. Love of one's country is, he insists, a virtue required by the Church; but nothing can override the other duty of loving one's enemies. That teaching applies in Germany as well as in France, says Cardinal Liénart; and how could he expect German bishops to preach love of their neighbour if he did not do the same himself? Even at the risk of being misrepresented and misunderstood, he declared, Catholics must not hesitate to support the efforts of the Holy See to foster peace.

The importance of that statement, in the circumstances surrounding the controversy, can scarcely be exaggerated. Cardinal Liénart is obviously one of the foremost organizers of Catholic Action in France and a most distinguished representative of the younger bishops and clergy. Recent events in Germany have certainly not assisted the propaganda of those Catholics in France who are striving for reconciliation, but Cardinal Liénart's brave pronouncement may well lead to similar pronouncements, under the inspiration of the Holy Father, from beyond the Rhine.

GERMANY.

By C. F. MELVILLE.

The Catholic Centre Party having refused to give a guarantee of tolerance of Hitler's government, the Nazis Chancellor has decided to go to new elections. Father Kaas, the head of the Centre, was offered the Ministry of Justice in return for such a guarantee, but he and his party decided against the bargain.

The reason for this refusal on the part of the Centre was that this party felt it could not give Hitler what would amount to *carte blanche* to overthrow the Constitution of Weimar. Hitler, therefore, is obliged to go to new elections in the hope of increasing the strength of his party at the polls, which he hopes to be able to do as the result of the prestige given to the Nazis by his assumption of the Chancellorship. After the elections, even if he does not get a majority, he will then govern by more or less dictatorial means. He is already getting ready to "make" the elections. His nominee at the Ministry of the Interior, Captain Goering, is already busy removing Social-Democrats and Centrists from positions in that Ministry and in the police administration. By these means he not only hopes to reduce the strength of the Opposition parties, but also to gain at the expense of his present Nationalist allies.

His rush into new elections is likely to be precipitate. Time is an urgent factor. For Hitler's party is composed mainly of

proletarianized *petit bourgeoisie* who are looking to the Nazi leader to fulfil his promise to conduct them into the economic promised land. If these dispossessed millions have time to realize that Hitler's present government is mainly dominated by the Big Business Barons—who have compelled Hitler to throw overboard the quasi-socialist items of his original programme—they will desert him in large numbers and go over to the Communists. Hence the necessity for Hitler to endeavour to have a success at the new elections before the present enthusiasm for his victory has time to cool down.

The Catholic Centre will fight him at the elections. They will probably do so mainly on the Constitutional issue. But it must be confessed that they are likely to be fighting a losing battle, as Hitler and his Nationalist friends seem bent upon throwing over the Constitution at all costs when the appropriate moment comes.

Not only the Centre Party, but also the Bavarian Peoples' Party, and the Catholic South German States generally are much alarmed at the prospects not only of the overthrow of the Constitution, but also at the already apparent Prussian centralist encroachments upon the federal liberties of the South. In this respect Hitler, aided (or perhaps controlled) by his Vice-Chancellor, Herr von Papen, is likely to go even further than the attempts in this direction made previously by the von Papen government.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

The MONTH for February has an exceptionally large number of really valuable articles. His Grace Archbishop Goodier in "Monsieur Vincent" contributes a study of St. Vincent de Paul which determines the salient facts of the Saint's life in the light of Père Pierre Coste's recent biography. He concludes in Père Coste's words: "Perhaps no one has more fully set before the world the omnipotence and providence of God. His foreseeing, energetic, universal charity combats every kind of misfortune, every kind of evil. . . . It might be said that he has reached the very bounds of charity beyond which henceforth no man can go." Mr. Henry Somerville in "Communism in Perspective" is insistent that we should not over-estimate the Communist menace in this country. Apropos of their propaganda he writes: "The Communists do the horse work of getting up these demonstrations, but without converting the demonstrators to Communism. It is next to impossible to convert the English masses to anything. Communist proselytizers do not succeed in doing quickly what Catholics find can only be done with geological slowness" (p. 131). Again: "When there is so much anti-God campaigning in progress, it would cause a bad impression if we Catholics expended too much of our powder and shot on the miserable economic Communists who already

have all the Press lords and all the police against them" (p. 133). He realizes the need of direct action in districts where Communism is directly aggressive, but considers that, in general, other methods than frontal attack are more likely to be successful. Fr. Martindale in "My Sacrifice and Yours" continues his great work of popularizing the Liturgy and makes several admirable points. Apropos of the musical reforms introduced by Popes Pius X and Pius XI he notes that "while everybody has talked of the musical reforms of these two Popes as concerned with the *kind* of music sung in churches, few have even alluded to the fact that they want the music to be *such that the Faithful themselves can sing it.*" And in regard of the S.C.R.'s reply of August 4th, 1922, that it is inexpedient that the faithful should answer Mass *instead of (loco)* a server, he remarks that: "Nothing therefore was here said about the Faithful answering *along with* the Server, as is done in more and more places. . . ." (p. 143). [See *Collationes Brugenses*, 1922, pp. 435-7.] The Editor's outspoken study of "The Catholic Conscience" draws attention to the large number of Catholics, "speaking generally the 'black-coated' worker, the rentier, the professional man, the employer, the financier, let us add, the clergy, (who) have been left collectively untouched by the Papal social doctrine" (p. 152). Altogether a magnificent number and amazing value at the reduced price of a shilling.

The January American ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW has a lively article by Dr. Edward Schwegler pleading for a fixed calendar, and a discussion by Fr. Hugh Pope, O.P., of "The Teaching of the Bible for the Ministry." Fr. Pope is convinced that in our teaching of Scripture too much emphasis is placed upon certain introductory questions only suitable for specialists, and that the ordinary student needs a more general course. "If one could have one's way one would like to see a student's early years given to systematic reading of the bare text of the Bible in English. No criticism should be allowed, but every effort made to render him familiar with the Divine story" (p. 26). His argument is reinforced by the great authority of the late Bishop Hedley in *Lex Levitarum*. The Bishop of Harrisburg's article in the Review for September, 1932, entitled: "Toward Intelligent Appreciation of the Breviary" is discussed by three experts, of whom two agree with and one dissents from the Bishop's plea for more intensive study of the Breviary during the Seminary course. Dr. George Rehring's contribution is especially valuable as showing the immense pains that are taken in at least one American seminary to ensure that the students will be able to read their Office with real intelligence. *Inter alia* "The breviary, as the text, is taught one period a week for one entire year (and), since the hymns present considerable difficulty to the average seminarian, one period a week for a whole year is devoted to their study" (p. 50). In a timely study of "Jericho and the Date of the Exodus," Fr. William McClellan, S.J., describes the new light thrown upon this question by Dr. Garstang's recent excavations.

BLACKFRIARS for February contains the full text of Archbishop Goodier's paper on "The Ideal of the Church," which was read "lately to a hundred and twenty clergymen of the Church of England . . . and created a great impression," the Editorial informs us, "because though written in a courteous manner it was yet uncompromising in doctrine" (p. 85). Fr. Ferdinand Valentine, O.P., concludes his excellent series on "Economics, Mothercraft, and Leakage" with a treatment of "Modern Social Conditions and the Art of Motherhood." "If mothercraft is to be resuscitated it must first of all be recognized as an art—the supreme art—and be taught; and the conditions of home life must be suitable for the practical application of such teaching" (pp. 113-14). In "Painting and the Public," a report of an after-dinner speech, Mr. Eric Gill has many wise and witty things to say. Mr. Alexander Parker gives an encouraging account of "Spain's Catholic Awakening," which ends with the words: "Whatever happens politically matters little in face of the beginnings of this wonderful Catholic revival. No Government can kill this, and it is bound to bear a glorious fruit that we may be privileged to see. 'Spain has ceased to be Catholic' were the famous words of the present Prime Minister. Events are already showing the magnitude of the lie" (p. 147).

The full theological explanation of the commission frequently given by the Holy See to a simple priest to act as extraordinary minister of confirmation is one of the perennial subjects of discussion among theologians. The latest contribution to the subject is made by a distinguished German theologian, Dr. Johannes Brinktine, of Paderborn, in *DIVUS THOMAS* (Piacenza) in the September-December number. After examining earlier solutions of the problem, Dr. Brinktine concludes that the power of confirming is not the "effectus immediatus ac directus consecrationis episcopalis" otherwise it could not be delegated to a simple priest; it is the "effectus tantummodo indirectus et mediatius, i.e., continetur in potestate ordinandi sicut minus in majore" (p. 516).

In the same number of *DIVUS THOMAS* Père Vosté adds to the ever-growing Albertine literature a careful study of St. Albert the Great as a commentator of the prophets.

The *REVUE BIBLIQUE* for January contains a long article by Père Vincent on the vexed question regarding the site of Pilate's judgment-hall. It is well known that this has been in the past the subject of unending discussion and till recently there seemed to be little hope of any certain issue of the enquiry. Now, as a result of recent archaeological investigation it seems certain that the site of ". . . the judgment seat in the place that is called Lithostrotos, and in Hebrew Gabbatha" (John xix. 13) is to be identified with a courtyard forming part of the fortress known as the Antonia, which was situated to the north-west of the temple area.

THE MODERN SCHOOLMAN for January, published at St. Louis University, Missouri, prints an extremely informing article by

Fr. Leo Keeler, S.J., Professor of History of Philosophy at the Gregorian University, on "The New Course of Ecclesiastical Studies." The origin and general character of the decree of May 24th, 1931, are carefully explained and a full account is given of the revised philosophical course. It may be hoped that Fr. Keeler will join to this a second article on the theological degrees. Fr. Keeler is also responsible for a useful select bibliography of philosophical works "compiled for the librarians of Catholic seminaries and schools of philosophy." This should certainly be reprinted as a pamphlet and given wide circulation. Fr. Robert P. Dachy, S.J., discusses a well-known epistemological question under the heading: "St. Thomas and the Universal Doubt."

The January *REVUE DES SCIENCES RELIGIEUSES*, produced by the Catholic Theological Faculty of Strasbourg, devotes nearly thirty pages to an article by Dr. J. Gross on "Le Problème des Origines dans la Théologie récente." Four recent works are examined in detail, those by the late M. Paquier, and by Dr. Bernhard Bartmann, Dr. Hubert Junker and Dr. Ernest Messenger. Dr. Messenger's book, *Evolution and Theology*, as the longest and most complete of these, receives the lion's share of Dr. Gross's attention. After summarizing the data furnished by recent pronouncements of Popes and Roman Congregations, Dr. Gross considers the evidence of the books under review. He concludes, apropos of evolution in general: "On peut donc tenir pour établi que ni la doctrine catholique ni la philosophie traditionnelle ne sont contraires à l'évolution des espèces. Il faut espérer que nos manuels renonceront à combattre cette théorie au nom de la Révélation et de la philosophie" (p. 51). On the subject of the evolution of man's body Dr. Gross is, naturally, much more cautious; his personal opinion is far from clear. He declares, after declaring that revelation and theology "ignorent l'évolutionisme, en tant que théorie scientifique, et ne peuvent pas plus lui faire opposition que lui prêter leur appui," that: "Néanmoins il reste permis de penser que le système transformiste est susceptible, non seulement d'ouvrir au théologien des vues nouvelles sur le monde et l'humanité, mais aussi de l'aider à se faire de l'action et de la nature divines une idée plus parfaite et plus élevée que celle que pouvaient lui fournir les théories d'autrefois" (p. 65).

The *RIVISTA DEL CLERO ITALIANO* for February is a number entirely devoted to the subject of the Breviary. The leading article by Monsignor Bernareggi, Coadjutor Bishop of Bergamo, discusses the Breviary in the life of the Church. Mgr. Tondelli writes on the inexhaustible subject of the beauty of the Psalms; Mgr. Cavagna gives some personal recollections of Mgr. Morganti, formerly Archbishop of Ravenna, and of the latter's efforts to encourage devotion to the Divine Office among his clergy; Mgr. Gorla resolves a number of cases of conscience concerned with the recitation of the Breviary; and Dr. Stocchiero deals with: *L'Ufficio Divino nel Diritto Canonico*. This eminently practical

review may be obtained from Milano (3/20); Piazza S. Ambrogio, 9. The subscription price for countries outside Italy is L.18.30.

In VERBUM DOMINI for January P. A. Vaccari begins a series on "Nomen Domini" in the Old and New Testaments; P. A. Skrinjar writes on Mich. v. 2-3 under the title "Origo Christi temporalis et aeterna"; and P. U. Holzmeister has an exegetical commentary on "Colloquium Domini cum muliere Samaritana." In Holzmeister's view, Jo. iv. 35 is not a proverbial expression, but an indication bearing on the chronology of the public ministry.

Among articles in the JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES for January one may mention Dr. R. P. Casey's thorough discussion of the apocryphal *Apocalypse of Paul* (the text of which is given in Dr. M. R. James's *Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. 525-55). Mr. G. R. Driver continues his valuable "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament," once again giving proof of his rare versatility as a philologist. The Rev. S. Harrison Thomson's pages on Grosseteste's work as a translator from the Greek should be of interest to many outside the ranks of the theologians. As usual, reviews occupy nearly half the number.

J. M. T. B.

,
).
s
.i
il
",
a,
c

r
n
n
).
e
of
n
e
e
r.

==
==